DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 408 871 HE 030 184

AUTHOR	Jenkins, Charles W. Ed.
TITLE	Perspectives on Leadership in Facilities Management.
INSTITUTION	APPA: Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers, Alexandria, VA.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-913359-90-4
PUB DATE	95
NOTE	134p.; Funding provided by NALCO Chemical Company. Papers were originally written for an Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers publication or meeting presentation.
AVAILABLE FROM	APPA: The Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers, 1446 Duke St., Alexandria, VA 22314-3492 ($25 members; $35 nonmembers).
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Building Operation; Business Administration; Change Agents; *College Buildings; Contracts; *Educational Facilities; *Educational Facilities Planning; Energy Management; Excellence in Education; Higher Education; Human Resources; Institutional Mission; Landscaping; *Leadership; Leadership Responsibility; Personnel Management; Productivity; Program Administration; Retrenchment; *School Maintenance; Small Colleges; Strategic Planning; Supervision

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers examines issues concerning leadership in facilities management in higher education. Chapters include: (1) "Catch the Spirit of Leadership" (Jack Hug); (2) "Visionary Leadership: Creating a New Tomorrow" (Burt Nanus); (3) "Some Thoughts on Leadership" (Charles W. Jenkins); (4) "Educational Leadership: The Role of Facilities in Educational Excellence" (Samuel H. Smith); (5) "Facilities Management at the Crossroads" (William A. Daigneau); (6) "Power, Influence, and Survival in Difficult Times" (Mark Pastin); (7) "Productivity Improvement Means Being Mission Driven" (John J. Garnand); (8) "Strengthening the Role of Facilities Management in a Small Institution" (Keith H. Lovin); (9) "A Call to Servant Leadership" (Kent M. Keith); (10) "How Leaders Create Change" (Charles W. Jenkins); and (11) "Sustaining Excellence: Bold Strategies for Transforming Your Organization" (William L. Maynard and Thomas J. Champoux). (Contains 73 references.) (JLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 408 871

Perspectives on Leadership *in* Facilities Management

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

APPA: The Assoc of H.E. Facilities Officers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

HE030 184

A Publication of
The Association of Higher Education
Facilities Officers

Sponsored by NALCO Chemical Company

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Perspectives on

Leadership *in* Facilities Management

Charles W. Jenkins, editor

Published by the Association of
Higher Education Facilities Officers
through the generous support of NALCO Chemical Company.

Copyright © 1995, APPA: The Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers. All rights reserved.

Some of these chapters originally appeared in *Facilities Manager*. "Visionary Leadership: Creating a New Tomorrow," by Burt Nanus; "Educational Leadership: The Role of Facilities in Educational Excellence," by Samuel H. Smith; and "Sustaining Excellence: Bold Strategies for Transforming Your Organization," by William C. Maynard and Thomas J. Champoux are printed here with the permission of the respective authors and are not for further reproduction.

Director of Communications: Steve Glazner
Publications Manager: Medea Ranck

Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN: 0-913359-90-4

The Association of
Higher Education
Facilities Officers
1446 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-3492

Contents

About the Authors v

Acknowledgments vii

Catch the Spirit of Leadership 1
Jack Hug

Visionary Leadership: Creating a New Tomorrow 5
Burt Nanus

Some Thoughts on Leadership 19
Charles W. Jenkins

Educational Leadership:
The Role of Facilities in Educational Excellence 29
Samuel H. Smith

Facilities Management at the Crossroads 39
William A. Daigneau

Power, Influence, and Survival in Difficult Times 51
Mark Pastin

Productivity Improvement Means Being Mission Driven 63
John J. Garnand

Strengthening the Role of Facilities Management in a Small Institution 75
Keith H. Lovin

A Call to Servant Leadership 85
Kent M. Keith

How Leaders Create Change 103
Charles W. Jenkins

Sustaining Excellence: Bold Strategies for Transforming Your Organization 113
William L. Maynard and Thomas J. Champoux

Bibliography 123

About the Authors

William A. Daigneau *is Assistant Vice President and Chief Facilities Officer, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, and former APPA Vice President for Educational Programs.*

John J. Garnand *is Senior Instructor in business policy and employment law with the College of Business and Administration, University of Colorado at Boulder.*

Jack Hug *is Assistant Vice Chancellor, Auxiliary and Plant Services at the University of California, San Diego, and former APPA President.*

Charles W. Jenkins *is Facilities Administrator at Saint Mary's University, San Antonio, Texas, and former APPA President.*

Kent M. Keith *is former President of Chaminade University in Honolulu, Hawaii; he is presently a doctoral student in the leadership program at University of Southern California.*

Keith H. Lovin *is the President of Maryville University of Saint Louis in Saint Louis, Missouri.*

William C. Maynard and Thomas J. Champoux *are founders of The Effectiveness Institute in Redmond, Washington.*

Burt Nanus *is Professor Emeritus, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Southern California, and author of* Visionary Leadership *and coauthor (with Warren Bennis) of* Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge.

Mark Pastin *is President, The Council of Ethical Organizations, Alexandria, Virginia, and author of* The Hard Problems of Management.

Samuel H. Smith *is the President of Washington State University in Pullman, Washington.*

Acknowledgments

You don't lead by pointing and telling people some place to go. You lead by going to that place and making a case.
— Ken Kesey.

Leadership is a combination of, and yet so much more than, the personal and professional qualities that comprise the individual. Not only are the values of the individual or the society of importance, but so are the ways in which the individual introduces and meshes those values to others who may have differing values, opinions, or purposes. This book addresses some of the issues facing us both as individuals and as stewards of our educational facilities.

The authors include university presidents, authors and speakers on management and leadership topics, and campus facilities officers. Virtually all of these chapters were originally written for an APPA publication or presented at an APPA educational program. We gratefully thank all of the authors for sharing their time and their wealth of knowledge and experience. The valuable information found in these pages will assist us as we rise to the tough future facing educational institutions.

We especially wish to thank Charlie Jenkins, of Saint Mary's University in Texas, for serving as field editor on this book. He

helped select the contents, provided editorial comment and suggestions, and wrote two of the chapters. Most importantly, Jenkins has provided APPA and the higher education facilities profession with a fine example of an individual demonstrating his leadership qualities and expanding his sphere of influence, both personally and professionally.

Chapters were edited by Steve Glazner, Medea Ranck, and Lourie Reichenberg. The book was designed and produced by Medea Ranck.

Finally, we are extremely pleased to recognize NALCO Chemical Company, of Naperville, Illinois, for their generous support of this publication. NALCO's long-standing support of APPA and the higher education facilities profession– through APPA scholarships, various services, and publication underwriting– continues to demonstrate their own leadership values and qualities.

Catch the Spirit of Leadership

by Jack Hug

THE YEAR 2000 WILL DAWN on a Saturday, less than five years from now. The half million people who will then be in the facilities management workforce will look back on a decade of change— all the more head-spinning because of its seemingly chaotic and transformational character. The changes are real, they're radical, and they're arriving everyday to a business or an institution near you. Some are opting for dramatic change as a planned and well thought out strategy. Others are changing because there simply is no alternative. Either way, it's tough, it's painful, and it's confusing.

Consider these events:

1. The average size of our facilities management departments measured by the number of individuals we employ has decreased in spite of the fact that the size of our facilities have increased.
2. The traditional hierarchies, these high-rise organizational structures, have given way to a variety of new organizational forms. The vertical division of labor is being replaced by a horizontal division.

3. Our paradigm of providing service is changing. On campus after campus, we have been handed a new mandate. A mandate to redefine our service measures in terms of results achieved for customers and results made possible by the services that we provide.

Part of the challenge we face lies in the very nature of what has to be done– keep everything running and operating at the lowest cost possible, satisfy every customer, while at the same time, change everything. One of our toughest jobs, no doubt, is designing a new organization while we operate the old one. We cannot "slam dunk" the new way into existence.

In considering our leadership role, I am reminded of the Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega Y Gassett. In Gassett's writings, "Mission of the University," he emphasized that education should help one "live at the level of one's time."

Since we are a vital part of the educational enterprise, what does it mean for us as facility managers to "live at the level of our time"? What do we need to know? What skills do we need to have? In today's climate, the hot new skills required for success are contained in leadership– the ability to manage this change culturally, structurally, and emotionally.

The management philosophies and techniques of the moment also require

- A leadership belief in worker teams,
- Customer focus, and
- Worker empowerment.

Let's stop and think for a moment also about leading a facilities management department today. We are characterized by intensive operations extending to every corner of the campus, serving many departments with a great variety of activities. Our job has become increasingly complex. In addition to dealing with new technologies and rapid changes, we must also be able to handle many different "relationships" with an expanding and influential constituency.

The watchwords for these relationships are cooperation, sharing, collaboration, teamwork, and partnership.

What we do requires effective delivery of facilities management services– services which truly and honestly allow the institution to get on with what it is intended to do. The challenge to our leadership is substantial and requires that we find the strength and resolve to combine, as a routine practice, both strong management and strong leadership. Accepting this challenge means addressing a large library of issues. A library that includes the integration of facilities management with institutional planning and policy, and with the quality of the higher education physical environment.

Leadership Belongs to Everyone

How are we going to effectively manage in this framework? One way is to accept that the work of leadership belongs to everyone. Today, there is a greater urgency than ever for us to understand and to connect solidly to the basic concept of the spirit of leadership. For it is through leadership as a friend, leadership as a partner, and leadership recognized as skills that can be acquired and skills that are required, that we can find a way to equip ourselves to do our job better. One consultant I know uses a familiar, power-packed phrase, "multiply yourself through others." This phrase has always been meaningful, but now its relevancy and importance are more fully understood. We need "multiples of leadership" at every level of the organization.

Authors Stephen and John Covey, in their work on principle-centered leadership, remind us that if we are going to be leaders we have a responsibility and a duty to think more broadly and more seriously about the answer to these kinds of questions:

- How do we (How can I) communicate clearly and express through behavior the beliefs and values of the institution?
- How do we (How can I) look at human weakness and shortcomings with compassion and understanding instead

of accusation? We need to be concerned about how people in the organization respond and cope with change and to understand interrelationships and patterns in solving complex problems.

- How do we (How can I) change and improve without creating more pain than gain? Help the organization view change as an opportunity for new alternatives and calculated risk taking.
- How do we (How can I) achieve a wise and renewing balance between work and family, between personal and professional ambitions in the middle of frequent crises and constant pressure?
- How do we (How can I) provide lean and simple statements of policy, consistent with organizational beliefs and values?

Where do we start? How do we keep energized to maintain momentum for learning, growing, and improving? How to do this successfully seems to me to be a leadership requirement that must be met if we are going to be in a position to live successfully at the level of our time.

The world is a classroom . . . but what kind of classroom is it? All around us we see that it is a rapidly changing classroom. As we look to this changing classroom, most of us will find it uncomfortable to think of ourselves as the ones to initiate and create the necessary change. But if not us, then who? If not now, when? Now is the time, this is the place, for you to decide what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be.

Visionary Leadership: Creating a New Tomorrow

by Burt Nanus

What can we expect about the future of colleges and universities that might be meaningful for facilities managers? We are all aware of the explosive technological change that surrounds us, caused by simultaneous and mutually reinforcing breakthroughs in many disciplines including, for example, materials, genetics, health care, electronics, space technology, automation, and instrumentation. The 21st-century college and university, in order to be considered competent and relevant, will have to ensure that its curricula and faculty research are always at the frontiers of all these relevant sciences and technologies. Facilities managers should expect the obsolescence of existing laboratories and classroom facilities to accelerate, which may lead to much closer collaboration with industrial and governmental research centers, perhaps even new facilities shared with those where the frontier research is being conducted.

The second obvious trend is the proliferation throughout the post-industrial economy, and throughout all university disciplines, of powerful information and communication systems. Since the

21st-century college and university will be expected to employ the latest information and communications technologies in all its educational delivery systems and research, we will see an increase in demand for these kinds of facilities, infrastructure, and services.

Third, with the globalization of business, politics, culture, and environmental concerns, the 21st-century university is going to have to be a global university tied to other leading institutions around the world, and will have to become expert in teaching students how to function effectively in diverse cultures. Facilities managers are likely to become key players in establishing linkages with these other institutions around the world, and some may well be responsible for millions of dollars of equipment and facilities located in other countries.

Fourth, economic stress throughout society is likely to ensure continued inadequate governmental funding for both higher education and elementary and secondary schools. As a result, the 21st-century university will face enormous financial pressures, as well as additional challenges in compensating for inadequate early preparation in schools and homes. This means increasing shortfalls of funding from government sources to cover overhead and facilities, and increasing pressures to do more with less.

Finally, the demographic and sociocultural shifts toward far more diversity and fragmentation of American values and lifestyles suggests the proliferation of demands for specialized courses and research agendas, as well as a multiplication of constituencies that expect to be served by colleges and universities. Thus, facilities managers will find increased demand for special facilities for various ethnic and cultural groups– fairs, exhibitions on campuses, increased demands for diversity of food and dormitory arrangements, and the like.

I could cite many other trends, but it's clear even with just these five that there will be rampant complexity, uncertainty, risk, and change as colleges and universities enter the 21st century. Every institution of higher education will have to be changing and adapting all the time, very likely at a far faster rate than they're

doing now, for a whole variety of reasons: to cope with these and other changes in the larger society; to be able to attract students, faculty, and resources; to grow to accommodate new constituencies and services in an increasingly multicultural institution; to do more with less; to achieve and be recognized for excellence; and to sustain hope among its faculty, students, and staff personnel.

It all adds up to conflicting forces and pressures pulling and pushing institutions of higher education in every direction; curricula and research agendas proliferating and plagued by rapid obsolescence with accompanying impacts on facilities and equipment; the collapse of the so-called ivory tower with pressures both inside and outside the institution to accommodate new student needs and to collaborate with outside organizations and experts; and insufficient resources to be all things to all people. This demands a particular kind of leadership for 21st-century colleges and universities at every level, not just at the top.

- Leaders who can point the way out of all the confusing forces and pressures that are tending to pull the institution in every direction.
- Leaders who are themselves change agents who can make the kinds of bold decisions that create the future in their own institutions and help it adapt quickly to technological change, faculty demands, and new student needs.
- Leaders who can inspire, challenge and empower faculties and staff, helping them reach their full potential and real fulfillment in their own careers.
- Leaders who can gain the confidence and support of diverse external constituencies.

I call this "visionary leadership." It requires leaders who can develop a powerful sense of direction and momentum for their institutions, and can marshal the energies and resources of the organization to move it in that direction. It is no longer enough to be just a good manager or administrator. It is not enough to be just a good compromiser between competing demands, or somebody who can somehow muddle through and keep an eye on

costs. What is needed is a leader, a person who can take the institution someplace else, who can make real progress in coping with the new realities.

The Difference Between Leadership and Management

It is important to make a clear distinction between leadership, as defined above, and management, which is the process of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling organizational resources. The manager is the person who maintains and operates the organization, while the leader is the person responsible for innovating and developing the organization. The manager always has to have both eyes on the bottom line, which means that inherently the manager is a present-oriented person, while the leader always has to have his or her eye on the horizon, making the leader inherently a future-oriented person. The manager is concerned with stability, predictability, and control, while the leader is concerned with flexibility, change, and adaptability. The manager is a problem solver, whereas the leader is a problem finder– somebody who looks for new issues and begins to marshal the resources to get the organization moving in a different direction. The manager deploys human resources while the leader serves, empowers, and develops human resources. Ultimately, the manager is concerned with efficiency, whereas the leader is concerned with effectiveness.

Facilities managers may be challenged to play both roles, but they must be clear which role they're playing. Often, the pressures for managerial action are such as to drive out the time available for leadership. This can be a serious problem in the kind of rapidly changing academic environment described earlier where leadership is so essential.

How do you know when leaders are effective? There are at least three measures of effectiveness that can be used. One is a new level of organizational achievement– e.g., an academic department moving into the top ten nationally in its field, or a facilities

management department that reduces the number of facilities complaints by 70 percent in the face of great financial challenges. In my book, *Visionary Leadership* (1992), I use the example of Regis University, a 110-year-old university that was nearly bankrupt before a new leader turned it around. It now has many vibrant new programs, has grown from 1,000 to 8,000 students in a single decade, and is a revitalized and strong institution today. There is little doubt about that leader's effectiveness. A second measure of effectiveness for leadership is growth in ability to serve, such as growth in employee capability, or increased loyalty of various constituencies. And finally, leadership can be measured by basic transformation in the character of the organization. A facilities manager may establish a new enterprise that better fits changing circumstances, like a new kind of dormitory or even a whole new campus. Or he or she may change the mission, philosophy, or values of the organization. Or he or she may form strong new partnerships that extend the service area, such as partnerships with the private sector or new research parks. This is how a leader demonstrates effectiveness— by results, by transformation, or by a radical improvement in the ability to survive and to serve.

Leadership Characteristics

Now, what can we say about the characteristics of successful leaders? Kouzes and Posner, in their book, *Credibility* (1993), reported a study of 15,000 executives who were asked to check off the characteristics they most admired in the leaders they personally would be willing to follow.

There was strong agreement on the following four characteristics:

1. *Honesty and integrity.* Trust is the glue that holds an institution together. If followers can't trust the leader, there will be few followers and little potential for achievement. The leader has to create a climate of integrity and trust by being honest, open, respectful, and by keeping all promises made.

2. *Forward looking.* When an organization is bombarded by change and risk from every direction, as universities are, and there are many new services demanded and great uncertainty, wisdom for the leader resides in being able to anticipate change, understand the forces that are shaping it, and position the organization to take advantage of those forces.
3. *Competence.* We expect our leaders to know the organization and how it works, and to have the people skills and other skills and knowledge that are important in exercising good judgment.
4. *Inspiring.* We expect leaders to be able to enthuse, energize, and stimulate others to take action. An inspiring leader genuinely cares about people, is willing to take responsibility, and passionately cares about the future of the organization.

Leadership Values and Attitudes

Along with these four characteristics, there are certain values and attitudes that also seem to apply to successful leaders. The first may be expressed as follows: "My function as a leader is to serve our constituencies— students, faculty, alumni, staff, the community, and so on— with empathy, compassion, and caring." The second is that leaders must fully commit themselves to the success of the organization. Effective leaders try to express the best that's in them. They develop their own self-knowledge to help them compensate for their weaknesses and build on their strengths. Successful leaders don't need other people to praise them, because they recognize their own achievements and seek their rewards internally rather than externally. They fully deploy themselves in the service of the organization.

The third important value is that leaders are perpetual learners and growers. Most leaders read widely, know a lot of people, are boundlessly curious, are good listeners, and are constantly rein-

venting themselves– seeking challenges, reflecting on experiences, learning from failures, and so on.

Fourth, effective leaders have a passion for the future of the organization. They have enthusiasm and optimism; they're risk takers; they have daring and courage; they are concerned about results; and they care about the legacy that they are leaving to their successors. Finally, leaders seek and accept responsibility for the institution's future. They have a sense of stewardship. They want to actively shape events, not just passively react to them.

Some people argue that leadership is a rare skill and that leaders are born, not made. Nothing could be further from the truth. Leaders may be born with certain leadership potential, but so are all of us– just as we're born with some potential to be parents or artists or runners. However, some of us develop our potential and others don't. Basically, leaders are self-made individuals who fully develop and display their leadership potential. Moreover, it is the job of every leader to create leadership positions at lower levels to give people the opportunity to develop their own leadership skills and grow in their leadership potential.

Roles of Leadership

What are the roles of leadership that must be mastered by effective leaders? In other words, what do leaders do? A leader is constantly balancing the present against the future and the needs of the inside organization against the needs of the outside environment. To achieve these balances, there are four key roles of leadership: (1) direction setter (i.e., developing a vision); (2) spokesperson (i.e., developing allies, representing the organization to outside constituencies, negotiating for the organization); (3) coach (i.e., motivating, inspiring, and developing personnel); and (4) change agent (i.e., decision making, innovating, forming new organizations, or deploying new information technologies). These four roles define what leaders actually do, although at any given time, a leader may be doing more of one and less of another.

The literature of leadership appears to concentrate on the coaching function, perhaps because most of the people who write about leadership are psychologists. But there is more to leadership than just the relationship between leaders and followers. In fact, leaders can't even do good coaching unless they have a good sense of direction. The direction-setting role is the one that drives the other three, since only with a vision can a leader be an effective spokesperson, coach, or change agent.

A vision is a realistic, credible, attractive future for an organization. All of us dream. We dream in a socially useful way as soon as we have an image of what is desirable, practical, useful, and attractive for our organization. After we give it a name, it takes on a reality, a motivating reality. It creates meaning in people's lives. It grabs attention and creates focus in the organization. People begin to see how what they're doing in the organization relates to the vision. That energizes people and provides a challenge to them. It also provides that all important bridge from the present to the future by showing how today's actions contribute toward the kind of organization the leader is building for the future. Ultimately it generates pride.

The right vision for a college or university, or for the facilities management function, would be appropriate for the organization and for the times. It would set high standards. It would reflect the organization's distinctive character. It would be widely shared, inspire enthusiasm and commitment, and be challenging. It would show a clear path toward a better future, and, most important, serve as the front end to a strategic planning process.

There's a clear difference between mission, vision, and strategy. A mission is a statement of purpose. Most colleges and universities have similar missions, although there might be slight variations between those of a research university and a small liberal arts college. On the other hand, there can be very different visions, or senses of how the educational enterprises should grow, which students it is hoping to serve, and what it wants to look like in ten or twenty years.

Examples of Vision

There are many different types of vision statements for a college. One type is a vision aimed at measures of ultimate value to the institution or society. These are outcome-related visions, such as: "This college or university aspires to be recognized as a world leader in research and instruction in (let's say) environmental sciences and natural resources." This vision says that if the institution moves in the indicated direction, it can stand out and become a world leader in that area, even if it is not a world leader in many other areas. Another example might be: "This university aspires to double the number of graduate students and facilities for graduate students in the next ten years."

A vision could also be related to the academic programs, (i.e., what is going to be learned and by whom). A vision might say: "This college aspires to provide each segment of the student population with unique programs and facilities tailored to its special needs, capabilities, and opportunities." This would lead to a university with many core programs involved with specialized niches. Another example might be: "This college aspires to excel in science and engineering, particularly in skills demanded by high-tech employers in our region over the next two decades."

Vision statements could also be related to processes. For example: "This institution aspires to increase cost effectiveness by making the fullest possible use of outside resources— businesses, libraries, professional associations, etc.— in both teaching and research." Or: "This institution aspires to become a national leader in the design and use of new information technologies to deliver customized educational experiences on and off campus, including, perhaps, the development and sale or proprietary software packages."

Another possibility is a vision related to how the university is organized. For example: "This college aspires to establish partnerships with the private sector to subcontract many services and to teach in employers' facilities so that students can be close to their

employment." Or: "This college aspires to establish overseas branch campuses in six countries over the next decade as part of a plan to become a global university." Or: "This college aspires to develop multiple uses for campus sites, including research parks, community resource centers, and conference centers to spread the cost of campus facilities and operations."

Different colleges can have different visions, and these will ultimately look quite different. In addition to vision, every leader needs a strategy, which is the long-term goals, objectives, and course of action designed to accomplish the vision. In the absence of a vision, there may be a strategy, but it likely either perpetuates the status quo (e.g., student loads, square footage, costs, etc., are simply projected into the future and called a strategic plan) or is purely opportunistic. In the latter case, a donor comes along with a bundle of cash and says, "I want this kind of facility," and the college complies. There is no vision, no direction, no cohesion. To move the organization forward— to move it to a place where it can function and prosper in the 21st century— it needs all three: a mission, a vision, and a strategy.

There are many examples in our society today where this rule has not been respected. IBM, for example, had very good strategies but when its vision became blurred, it got into trouble. No organization, including IBM, can be all things to all people anymore, so they must decide what they're going to emphasize— software, hardware, computer services, PCs, etc. There are other examples in our society of a good vision but poor strategies. For example, the solar energy industry has a fine vision of how we might at some future time use solar energy for many different applications, and for some the technology already exists and is cost effective. But the industry has a poor strategy on how to get there. But then there are leaders like Nelson Mandela in South Africa who was enormously successful because he was able to combine a great vision and a great strategy.

The major lesson for facilities planners who find themselves on campuses devoid of a vision and strategy is that they may have to

serve as the catalyst that makes it happen by asking the right questions. A facilities planner might be able to put the campus administration and Board of Trustees on the spot by saying, "Look, we've got to know exactly where this institution is heading if we're going to make intelligent decisions in the facilities area. Otherwise, you may be wasting millions of dollars on facilities that won't be right for the 21st century. And you're going to find that you're always chasing problems and never catching up."

Developing Vision

Where does vision come from? First, a great deal of information is needed– information about the past, the present, the future. Past history, trends, traditions, and values; present structures, opinions, and the needs of various constituencies; projections and anticipations of the future in various areas such as what the government is likely to do and where technology is headed.

Second, one must understand what is valued in the institution, such as student needs and wants, alumni values, faculty needs, and values of the campus leadership. Third, there is a need for a mental model of how the world works. When I do a visioning exercise with universities, this mental model usually takes the form of scenarios– alternative directions that the future can unfold in ways that are relevant for the particular institution. Then we try to think of what's the best positioning for this institution in those various worlds.

Ultimately a vision comes together with insight, intuition, judgment, and some creative synthesis of ideas. This can be done by an individual or in a group setting, but because of the collegial nature of higher education, I recommend the participative mode. APPA itself is going through a visioning exercise, and facilities managers ought to think about doing visioning exercises on their own campuses, both with their own staffs and also as members of teams looking at the overall university or college's vision. I've been involved in five of these visioning exercises on college campuses

and many others in the private and public sectors. I've used slightly different approaches in each case, but they all included a several-day retreat with key people, sometimes as many as twenty-five, involved in a systematic approach to developing a vision. We looked ahead at least ten years and, in some cases, twenty, to formulate the vision. We focused on the big picture. The exercise helped build consensus and trust, helped locate champions for new ideas, and in most cases, resulted in new visions that could be used to drive strategies and action.

Basically, there are four major steps to go through in such an exercise. There is a "vision audit" to explore the current strengths and weaknesses of the organization, and what would happen if it continues on its current strategy. Then, there's the "vision scope," which examines the critical stakeholders in the organization, measures of effectiveness, timing for the vision and other boundary conditions. The third step is the "vision context" in which changes in the external environment that have relevance for the vision—technology, economic, political, and so on— are explored. Finally there is the "vision choice," which means developing possible visions that fit these considerations and evaluating them against various criteria, and ultimately converging a particular vision for the organization.

The advantage of such a visioning exercise is that it ensures broad participation in the search for a vision and benefits from a wide range of viewpoints. It also is quick, efficient, cost effective, and systematic. It deals with alternative future scenarios. Every one of these exercises ended up with an agenda to drive strategy and decision making in the future (see Nanus 1995).

The essence of leadership is working with others to develop a vision of the future, communicating the vision, getting broad commitment to it, and using the vision to make the necessary changes in the organization. The basic idea is that vision plus communication equals shared purpose. Shared purpose leads to empowered people, and appropriate organizational changes that add up to successful visionary leadership.

Developing Leadership

What can you do to develop visionary leaders in your own organization? First and foremost, develop a clear vision for your own organization, if one doesn't already exist. Second, develop your own skills as a visionary leader, both to increase your own effectiveness and to serve as a role model for others.

Third, identify and encourage visionary leaders throughout your organization. Find people who already have a track record of leadership. It need not necessarily have been in a university context. Maybe they once served as president of a fraternity or sorority, captain of a sports team, deacon in a church, or head of a local PTA. Look for evidence that suggests that they have developed a leader's way of thinking– the attitudes, values, skills, and roles discussed earlier.

Fourth, look for individuals with the ability to learn and grow. They should have the key characteristics that came out of the Kouzes/Posner study– honesty, competence, forward looking, and inspiring– and they should be able to fulfill the key roles of direction setting, spokesperson, coach, and change agent. Another indicator is readiness. Look for maturity, breadth of judgment, self-knowledge, and relevant experience to be ready to move into a higher level of leadership responsibility.

Finally, facilities managers can help each other become better leaders. For example, it should be possible to establish in each major city or geographic region "leadership advisory boards," where facilities managers in local educational institutions come together once a month to share their leadership problems, and discuss important leadership books with their peer group. They can help develop each other as leaders, because most leaders learn best from their own experiences and from sharing the experiences of other leaders faced with similar challenges.

Conclusions

To summarize, the future environment will go through dramatic changes that have great implications for all aspects of college and university operations, especially facilities. These changes raise new issues and challenges that make it impossible to get along only with good management– leadership is essential. In fact, this demands a particular kind of leader in higher education– leaders who can point the way out of all these confusing forces impinging on the institution; leaders who are change agents themselves; leaders who can gain the confidence of diverse constituencies; leaders who can build and develop their own organizations and their knowledge base in anticipation of challenges yet to come; and leaders who can form alliances and partnerships outside the organization to advance the interests of the institution and spread its risks and costs. This defines "visionary leadership."

At the same time, the new circumstances require extraordinary management– managers who can operate facilities efficiently in the face of great turbulence; who can achieve high levels of service to all the stakeholders in the academic community; who can constantly improve operations and information systems; and who can inspire and challenge workers. This might be called strategic management in its highest sense. The point is that we need both visionary leadership and strategic management to succeed. Both are as vital for renewing existing services and operations as for starting new ones.

Although certain characteristics and attitudes were shown to be necessary for successful leadership, vision is the key to it all. That powerful image of the future is what drives decision-making and inspires people to high achievement. Many colleges and universities were founded on a dream. As we enter the 21st century, we must dream anew and act anew to make them equal to the challenges of the new millennium.

Some Thoughts on Leadership

by Charles W. Jenkins

I have been reading a lot recently on the subject of leadership and have discovered that it's a very broad subject. One of the authors I've read says that in researching for his book he discovered more than 350 definitions for leadership. They're usually pretty complex definitions, too. Consider this from *A Passion for Excellence* by Tom Peters and Nancy Austin (1985): "The alternative we now propose is leader (not manager) as cheerleader, enthusiast, nurturer of champions, hero finder, wanderer, dramatist, coach, facilitator, builder." Excuse me, then, if I choose not to get too deeply into describing leaders but instead focus on a single observation that makes a lot of sense to me.

A common thread that runs through all my readings is this: Leadership is different from management. Leaders and managers behave differently and do different things. It's this difference that I'd like to explore. Each of the authors puts his or her own spin on the difference. The following metaphor comes from Stephen R. Covey (1989).

You can quickly grasp the important difference between the two if you envision a group of producers cutting their way through the jungle with machetes. They're the producers, the problem solvers. They're cutting through the undergrowth, clearing it out.

The managers are behind them, sharpening their machetes, writing policy and procedure manuals, holding muscle development programs, bringing in improved technologies and setting up working schedules and compensation programs for machete wielders.

The leader is the one who climbs the tallest tree, surveys the entire situation, and yells, 'Wrong jungle!'

But how do the busy, efficient producers and managers often respond? 'Shut up! We're making progress.'

My favorite, and I believe most succinct, explanation of the difference is found in the writings of Dr. Warren Bennis, a retired educator who served for several years as the president of the University of Cincinnati. He's now, among other endeavors, a noted consultant on leadership and management and he has written four valuable books on leadership. In each of them he states the following at least once: "Managers do things right; leaders do the right things."

Whatever does that mean? Bennis goes on to explain that good managers excel in the ability to handle the daily routine, yet never question whether the routine should be done at all. They complete each day's activities with skill and efficiency, they put out all fires, they clear every hurdle, but never ask, "Is what I'm doing or what my department is doing the most productive thing we can be doing for the university?" Leaders, on the other hand, do ask that question, regularly and frequently. Managers, I think, tend to honor the status quo. Leaders seek change, even to the point of chaos. Managers say, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Leaders say, "If it ain't broke, break it and put it back together better."

Now, I contend that given those definitions, we in the higher education facilities business tend to manage almost exclusively. I

think our bosses, the business officers, do the same and, for the most part, their bosses, the university presidents, as well. The end result is that higher education falls into that group of American institutions that Bennis refers to as "overmanaged and underled."

Facilities officers come by it naturally, of course. Being good managers is what got us to where we are today. We have a book that is referred to as the APPA bible, entitled *Facilities Management: A Manual for Plant Administration*. It's 1,577 pages long. There are twenty-two pages, or about 1.4 percent, devoted to the joint topic of "Motivation and Leadership." Leadership didn't even get first billing. We have a magazine called *Facilities Manager*. For those who are inclined to seek it, we have an award called the Award for Excellence in Facilities Management, not Leadership. My friends, I contend that, like our handbook, we spend 98 percent of our time managing and, at the extreme, 2 percent leading. I further contend that the challenges of our workplace today demand that we alter that ratio significantly.

I don't for a minute suggest that we stop managing and become pure leaders. I simply think we must devote more time than we have been to behaving like leaders. If we can't do both, then it's better to stay pure managers. In *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*, Dr. John Kotter discusses the issue of strong management/weak leadership vs. the opposite and concludes that "Strong leadership with weak management is no better, and sometimes actually worse, than the reverse" (Kotter 1990). So, all I'm talking about here is a micrometer adjustment in our style.

Kotter also writes, "No one has yet figured out a way to manage people effectively into battle." That indicates to me that war stories are a good place to look for examples of leadership. I recently heard an address in which the Commanding General of the Fifth United States Army related a story from the Gulf War in Kuwait. He had heard the story from a reliable source, his son-in-law, who actually participated in the event. The general's son-in-law was assigned to an armored reconnaissance unit. Their job was to

range out ahead of the main armored force and discover the enemy before being discovered, thus gaining the element of surprise for their unit. On this occasion, they had done exactly that. They had come upon a column of sixteen Russian tanks, manned by Iraqi crews, in a line across the desert. The American scouts were unobserved. They radioed back to the main force to report their discovery.

Soon the unit commander, a young lieutenant colonel, arrived in his command vehicle with a few of his staff. He sized up the situation and radioed back the message, "Send up one M1A1 tank." Soon the tank arrived. He instructed the crew, "Shoot the tank on the far left end of the line. We'll wait ten minutes and see what they do." The tank crew aimed and fired a single round. It struck the target vehicle squarely between the treads and at the center of the armor plate meant to deflect such projectiles. Instead, it penetrated the armor, passed completely through the tank, and out the other side. It was a high explosive shell, but for some reason it failed to detonate. Nonetheless, in passing through the tank it blew the turret completely off and onto the ground beside the tank. This was from a range of over 2,000 meters, somewhere between a mile and a mile and a half. The Iraqis had no idea what had happened. They could see no enemy. They had heard only a whoosh and seen one of their tanks destroyed. The remaining crews dismounted their vehicles and fled on foot into the desert.

The general told that story to illustrate the awesome power of U.S. weaponry and the excellence of the training provided American troops, but then he went on to say, "Ladies and gentlemen, I submit to you that no society other than ours could have produced that young commander, who made a conscious decision to shoot one tank and wait ten minutes." I submit to you that it was the act of a leader. He could have been a superlative manager. He had the opportunity, the training, and the resources to annihilate the enemy force in business-as-usual fashion. Instead, he honored the ethic of respect for human life. He shot one tank and waited 10 minutes. He did the right thing.

But, Charlie, you say to me, I'm not fighting a war in the desert. My battle isn't nearly so dramatic nor are my decisions so obvious. How am I to know what is the right thing? My reply is simple– ask.

In *How to Win Customers and Keep Them for Life,* Dr. Michael LeBoeuf (1987), also a retired educator, talks about the two platinum questions. They are: "How are we doing?" and "How can we get better?" To find the right things to do, ask those questions of two groups on campus. The first group, of course, is your customers. They'll give you some great ideas, I guarantee.

How do you ask them? One of the best ways I know of is a customer survey. We've all seen them. It's hard to go to the restaurant anymore without finding one on the table. Please rate our service from "excellent" to "poor" in each of the following areas. That's "How are we doing?" Then there's always a group of empty lines with the heading "Comments." That's "How can we get better?" You can use the exact same format to survey your customers' degree of satisfaction with your organization's service. It's being done quite successfully at many universities and colleges. There's a wealth of suggestions for right things to do in a customer survey, whether you use a written instrument or conduct it face-to-face with the survey participant.

The second group to ask the platinum questions of is the facilities department staff, those service providers who interact with your customers every day. The form of the question may be as simple as, "Name one thing you'd like to be able to do for your customer but can't because of some department or university rule?" Or ask them straight out, "How can we get better?" Now we're talking about such TQM strategies as quality of worklife and empowered workers. This group also has great ideas. They'll tell you some right things to do.

Did you notice that I said to ask "facilities department staff?" I didn't say "your staff" or "the people who work for you." Have you ever leaned back and expansively said, "Well, I'm only as good as the people who work for me?" If you have, I suggest that you're wrong on two counts. In the first place, you probably aren't that

good. In the second, they don't work for you. They work for the university, for probably as many different reasons as there are staff members. They've simply been entrusted by the university to your stewardship. That stewardship entails giving them direction, motivation, leadership, satisfaction, recognition, nurturing, and myriad other things that make the workplace where they spend one-third to one-half of their lives a rewarding place to be.

They're your colleagues, your associates, and your teammates, in a joint endeavor to provide superlative customer service to the community. To speak or think of them as "your people" conjures the vision of a paternalistic, patronizing supervisory style that is obsolete. It no longer works. Revisiting your personal style might be one of the first right things you should do if you indeed consider them "your people." But let me tell you something else. You will have done a right thing just by asking the platinum questions. Peters and Waterman, in *In Search of Excellence* (1982), call it getting close to the customer. In A *Passion for Excellence* Peters and Austin (1985) call it listening naively. In *Principle Centered Leadership*, Stephen Covey (1990) mentions a "stakeholder information system (SIS)," the stakeholders in your success being the customers, the staff, your suppliers, etc. Asking the platinum questions exercises that SIS.

There's still another reason why it's a right thing to do. We all know about Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Maslow postulates that all human needs can be sorted into categories and then rank ordered by their importance to us. At the bottom of the hierarchy are physiological needs, the basic things like air, food, and shelter. If those are missing, nothing else matters until we get them. When we have them, the next important needs are safety, security, and stability. As those needs are satisfied we then graduate to social needs (companionship, affection, friendship), then to ego, status, and self-esteem needs such as recognition and status, and, finally, to self-actualization needs such as growth and advancement.

Frederick Hertzberg further asserts that the needs on the two lowest tiers are not motivators, just maintainers. If things such as shelter, safety, and security aren't there, people are dissatisfied. If they are there, however, people aren't necessarily satisfied– they just aren't dissatisfied. As an employer, providing those things for employees won't motivate them, but not providing them will certainly demotivate them. So, the best you can hope for is a neutral feeling. It's only when you fulfill the ego and self-actualization needs at the top of the ladder that you can satisfy and motivate people (Kirkpatrick 1987).

Some years ago, I heard a speaker use the Maslow hierarchy to explain why the best we can ever hope for in our business is anonymity. He pointed out that our very mission is to remove those dissatisfiers at the bottom of the hierarchy. We don't satisfy, we just assure the absence of dissatisfaction. If we aren't getting hate mail and reading negative stories in the student newspaper, we're doing a super job. That was his theory, and now I'm finally to the crux of my theory.

When you go to your customers and ask them the platinum questions, look at where you're interacting with them. Way up in the ego and status range. You're seeking their wisdom and inviting them to assist you with your challenges. You're recognizing that they have valuable insights. You're stroking those egos and increasing self-esteem and self-respect among your customers. Anonymity, indeed! Not any more. Now you're a satisfier and a motivator, and all just because you asked. Don't be surprised if you read a complimentary article in the student newspaper, either. It has happened.

By the way, the same dynamic works when you ask the staff for their opinion. They have egos, just as your customers do. But be forewarned: you're inviting change when you ask the platinum questions. You can't ask and then ignore everything you hear. You'll be watched carefully to see how you respond to the mandate represented by the answers given you. Don't be concerned that no one else on the campus is doing it. Nancy Austin

says that you can be "an island of excellence in a sea of mediocrity." And so you can.

The naysayers and status quo defenders have been around forever and will probably always be. Consider the following classic example from our nation's history.

My friends, the train of change is coming for higher education, and those administrators who want to usher the industry into the 21st century are lining up to get their tickets to ride.

So, put down that machete you've been sharpening and find a tall tree. Break something that ain't broke. Ask the platinum questions and respond to what you hear. Get on board the train.

January 31, 1829

To President Jackson:

The canal system of this country is being threatened by the spread of a new form of transportation known as "railroads." The federal government must preserve the canals for the following reasons:

One. If canal boats are supplanted by "railroads," serious unemployment will result. Captains, cooks, drivers, hostlers, repairmen, and lock tenders will be left without means of livelihood, not to mention the numerous farmers now employed in growing hay for the horses.

Two. Boat builders would suffer and towline, whip, and harness makers would be left destitute.

Three. Canal boats are absolutely essential to the defense of the United States. In the event of the expected trouble with England, the Erie Canal would be the only means by which we could ever move the supplies so vital to waging modern war.

As you may know, Mr. President, "railroad" carriages are pulled at the enormous speed of fifteen miles per hour by "engines" which, in addition to endangering life and limb of passengers, roar and snort their way through the countryside, setting fire to crops, scaring the livestock and frightening women and children. The Almighty certainly never intended that people should travel at such breakneck speed.

Martin Van Buren
Governor of New York

Excerpted from *Dying for Change*, Leith Anderson, 1990.

Educational Leadership: The Role of Facilities in Educational Excellence

by Samuel H. Smith

I would like to talk about change, because dramatic change is occurring in higher education. You can describe this change several ways. Some thirty years ago, John F. Kennedy made the statement, "Change is the law of life. And those who look only to the past or the present are certain to miss the future." That was a very positive way of phrasing it, a very delicate way, and also a very important way. Colleges and universities are now immersed in a period of tremendous change, but it is not delicate.

Perhaps some of you are old movie buffs. How many of you have seen the movie in which a little boy stands with his father on the edge of their farmstead; they're looking out across an open area, and they see somebody approaching. The little boy says, "Someone's coming, Pa. Someone's coming." They don't know who's coming, they don't know what the person's going to do, but they do know that their lives are going to be changed by the very fact that person is approaching.

In many ways that's what's happening today in higher education. Change is coming. We are not exactly sure if it's threatening or not, but it's on the way. And its very presence will alter our lives and the way we do business. I'll use another image, one perhaps a little closer to home. All of you have been involved in commencements. A few years ago I was in a commencement line at Washington State University. Two lines of graduates were coming up either side of the floor. They would receive their diplomas and come back down the center of the floor. I stood in the center and shook hands with each graduate. Two long lines of graduates are coming through and I am shaking hands about once every four seconds.

One graduate came through and he stared at me. In my business when a graduate or student stares at you, you notice. He came through, got his diploma, shook my hand, and then said, "Mind if I stand here for a moment with you?" Ten to fifteen thousand people are in the audience watching. I'm still shaking hands every four seconds. I said, "All right, for just a moment, but don't stay too long." Pretty soon a female graduate comes up. She appears nervous. Well, she approaches, gets her diploma, and comes back down to the center. This fellow steps in front of me, kneels down, whips out a ring, slips it on her finger, and says, "Will you marry me?" True story. She's standing there, he's hugging her, and she is in shock. People are backing up because they're still approaching at one every four seconds. The audience was on its feet and applauding. What do you do? I wished them well and they were on their way together. By the very fact that she was asked the question, by the very situation, her life was changed. It does not matter whether she said yes or no. Her life was changed whether she wanted it to be or not.

What we're seeing right now in higher education is similar. We're seeing changes occur– some positive, some negative, and some we're not so sure about. Twenty years ago, the American dream was to start children off on the path of life, have them go through a K-12 system, study hard, do well, get into college, graduate, enter

a profession, and be successful. Universities and colleges were looked upon as important developmental phases in the lives of young people. They were looked upon as part of a seamless education from kindergarten through college.

Those days are largely gone. Higher education is now seen as an "extra" something that is nice to have available, but not essential. We keep hearing higher education described more as a fringe benefit than as a necessity. We keep hearing it described as something we afford to do. Is this all bad? Is everything gloomy? I say no. We have a series of opportunities within higher education that have never been there before. But we've got to change our operating patterns and operate in a more forthright manner. What's required today in our changing environment is a university community with leadership from all parts of the community capable of adjusting its own pattern of business and explaining what it's doing and why it is important to the general public. The public that used to tolerate us, which paid for us because they thought we must be good, has started noticing that higher education is big business.

I've been in higher education for many years, yet I'm amazed by the dollar figures that we use when we describe our institutions. Unless your college or university spends significant number of dollars, you're considered small. Unless you have an operating budget of half a billion dollars, you're considered mid-sized. When you start talking about millions and, indeed, billions of dollars, the general public wants to know what we're doing with their money.

We are asked: "What's your product? What does your university produce? How do you measure it?" Can you imagine a major company responding, "Well, I don't know what I produce"? Can you imagine a breakfast food corporation saying, "Well, we put things out in boxes; I think they're good"? We don't explain what we do because in many cases we don't really know how to describe our product.

Change is being exacerbated by a tough economic environment. A number of years ago we counted on the federal govern-

ment to supply a base level of support for universities and colleges, but the federal government started reducing its continuing support. What happened then was that the individual states entered into a marvelous competition. Each state was largely on its own. How well they supported higher education determined how well their economy performed in the future. Some states did well. Some states did not realize there was a competition.

You can't pick up the *Chronicle of Higher Education* without reading about budget cuts. From the June 17, 1992 issue: California state's public colleges were bracing for cuts of from 17 to 33 percent in the 1992-93 academic year. These are numbers that none of us would ever have thought possible, numbers that would only have occurred in some of our worst nightmares. We're talking about increased costs and decreased budgets, and we're talking about it at a time when the public is not sympathetic to higher education.

To those of you in private institutions, we have further complicated your lives. Public colleges and universities are now raising significant amounts of private funds. So, in addition to having all of the normal problems you have as far as rising costs and tight economies, public institutions are now competing with you in fund raising.

To meet these challenges I'd like to suggest a change in an internal approach, and then suggest an external approach that we might take. Finally, I will use my own institution, Washington State University, as an example of some things that higher education is attempting. As I start to describe an internal approach, I will use some broad generalizations. When you look within institutions of higher education, often you see three significant populations. First, of course, are the students, a population that has been well documented and discussed. However, I will discuss the other two populations because they are germane to our discussion.

The second group is what I call the academic population. These are primarily faculty, researchers, administrators, and an increasing number of administrative or support staff. Many are in categories

or areas than did not exist ten or fifteen years ago. This academic population is usually considered to be transient or temporary. The average number of years of service for the academic are usually ten, fifteen, or twenty. The academic population is seen as bringing in the dollars. We count their grants, gifts, contracts, and awards. You read about individuals in the academic population in the newspaper. There is a national or international market or frame of reference.

The next population is usually the dominant one in numbers of employees at any university. It is what I call the permanent population. This is the staff involved with facilities, operations, maintenance, dining halls, residence halls, grounds, motor pool, and a host of other categories. These individuals work for twenty, thirty, or forty years. This permanent population is seen as costing dollars. Also, you don't often read about these individuals in the newspapers. You read about the new building that went up late, or you read about the hazardous waste site that someone should have cleaned up. The permanent staff market is often from a local or statewide market rather than national or international.

Please keep these populations in mind: students, academic, and permanent when you consider that many colleges and universities claim to have planned for the future.

Frankly, if business planned like higher education, we'd all be out of business. When planning occurs within universities, we talk about what we're going to do and we assume growth. We assume that the world is a positive place, and we continue to add programs and people, never dropping anything. When the budget periods of the last ten or fifteen years started turning against us and many universities went through what I call a surface reorganization, they were not confident of where to make the necessary budget cuts. Keep in mind the primary decision makers in universities are the academics.

Remember those populations? If the primary decision makers are the academics and someone is going to have to take a cut and you don't want to cut the number of students it wasn't really

surprising that the majority of the cuts were taken in the nonacademic, permanent population.

Very few academic employees were affected by the first round or two of budget cuts. As the cuts have continued, and operating costs continue to escalate, cuts are starting to be more frequent in academic areas. But, the funding for the nonacademic or permanent areas have not been restored and continue to be restricted.

I agree with the president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching when he suggested that a university's priorities are dramatically revealed by the way facilities are maintained and the importance that is assigned to the physical plant itself. Our recent budget cutting process has revealed that very strongly. A cut of deferred maintenance funding, for example, is more easily made by the academic population because the long-term benefits or problems are probably not going to be theirs.

From a business management viewpoint, one of the expected and logical changes that has occurred is in how a university or college makes a decision. If we receive new funds, I am very pleased to make the decision and tell you what you will receive.

In bad financial times, however, the pronoun shifts from "I" to "we." We develop a process because we don't want to tell you that you can't have something you need or want. Academic administrators want someone to share the blame. Higher education institutions have usually developed a reconfiguration process or retrenchment process or a shared decision-making process on how to handle their budget deficit. They are trying to get everyone, by consensus, to take ownership. I am talking about participation in institutional decision making. In many instances, we arrived at a positive outgrowth of our very negative budget environment. The economic woes we are going through have made a process available to many who were not included before.

In the past, students were often included in decision making, but the permanent employees were not. Now our budget environment creates the opportunity for all three populations to be

included in the decision-making process. This should be viewed as probably the single greatest opportunity that has occurred in the last few decades for those involved in the permanent population. There is now a greater opportunity to actually be involved.

From a financial viewpoint, the true analogy to what many of our institutions are undergoing would be a family crisis. Higher education is experiencing a family crisis. For example, let's imagine there's been a death in the family, or things are really tight financially. The family pulls together and says, "We have to figure out how to work together to handle this crisis." It's usually one or two people who are senior within the family who lead the way. Within most families there is often one person who doesn't want to go along, one person who doesn't think he or she ought to chip in to help cover the bills. No matter what happens over the next twenty years, everybody in the family is going to remember the person who wasn't helpful. During the crisis we have in higher education, we have to make sure nobody ends up like this disfavored relative.

Many involved in facilities management are on the edge of being the disfavored relative. They were first into the cuts, and in many cases the cuts perhaps were considered and, indeed, unfair. We have to make sure those involved in facilities management who experienced early cuts can get back on the team where they can talk and be part of the decision-making process.

If you look at what's occurring and want to become more involved in decision making, what can you do? Let's go back to John Kennedy's comment, "Change is the law of life. And those who only look to the past and present are certain to miss the future." You can change things now.

I visited with a group in the southeastern part of our country and spoke to a facilities manager who complained, "Woe is me, things are terrible, things are bad, we're all going to fall apart tomorrow." I asked him a few simple questions: "What are your options? Is the university going to close?" The answer was no. "Are the buildings going to go away?" The answer was no. "Are your problems going

to go away as far as cleaning or maintaining?" The answer was no. We started talking about available options, and it turned out there were several changes he'd been waiting to make for years. For instance, for several years he wanted to close one of his shops, but could not do so. He had another area where he had a considerable amount of what I loosely call "dead wood." Due to the budget crisis, he will be able to accomplish his goals in both of these areas as an effect of the decentralized decision-making process.

If I were to leave you with one message, it is that these tough times aren't going to last forever; you'd better take advantage of them now. Instead of just planning for growth, colleges and universities must also plan for downsizing. Instead of just planning for enhancement, we must plan for elimination. I maintain that this is the time when all three populations of the college and university community should plan for the future. We need to develop real vision of what we want our institution to become twenty-five and fifty years from now. If you take a twenty-five or fifty year view of the future, if you develop a long-range vision, then many of our short-term problems fall into perspective as opportunities.

For those of you in facilities management, a long-range vision is your best argument. When you start talking about what your institution should be twenty-five or fifty years from now, the question of items such as deferred maintenance falls into a better perspective. The question of increasing costs of facilities falls into place. If you have a long-term vision and it doesn't have to be crystal clear the permanent population of the university and its perspectives rise to the forefront.

I've often been told that you cannot plan twenty-five or more years in advance. I disagree. If you look at demographic trends, if you look at many of the trend lines, there are not that many surprises. Let's assume your institution recruits high school graduates, many of whom enter your college or university right out of high school. You can count the number of people born, you can count the number that are in the K-12 system, you can count the number that are in the seventh grade, you can estimate the

dropout rates, and you can count the number of older students returning. You can make some reasonable projections over a twenty-year period. You can view a series of demographic trends and make a convincing case about what your institution should be doing. The more you shift the university's view to the long range, the easier your job is going to be and the better you can serve and build your college or university.

Washington State University, which is isolated in the southeastern corner of the state, took this as a challenge several years ago. In 1985, we were told by a number of legislators in our state that support for universities would start to be reduced. We had a choice. We could have stood around and said, "Woe is me." We could have circled the wagons and shot inward, or we could have attempted to go out and do something. To make a long story short, we moved out, and started three new campuses, which are doing well. We're in the midst of one of the biggest growth periods in our history, we're doing the best we've ever done as far as grants and contracts, and we're probably doing an even better job of recruiting faculty and students than we've ever done, because we tried to portray a long-term vision.

This is a time to take risks. You're probably now in a better position to influence your institutions and the direction of your profession than you've been in the last twenty years. If you can help develop the concept of long-term goals and vision, if you can move more effectively into that decision-making process, if you can get away from being the disfavored relative, I think you will then see a better future for campus facilities, in a better and more optimistic manner, than we've had in many, many years.

It is true, "Someone's coming, Pa. Someone's coming." Actually, something is coming down that road, and it is an opportunity. Please go out and take advantage of it. What you don't want to do is say to yourself ten years from now, when things are better, "I should have made more changes when I had the chance." These tough times are not going to last forever. We had better take advantage of them now.

Facilities Management at the Crossroads

by William A. Daigneau

During the last century, railways were a critical ingredient in the development of the industrial age. An industry in their own right, they created and supported significant numbers of jobs, with hundreds of enterprises involved in construction, manufacturing, chemicals, energy, real estate, and finance. They also owned one of history's most enormous facilities. Their railroad terminals were designed by some of the great architects and engineers of their time. Their professional and trade associations kept them current on all the latest news, regulations, and developments. But by the middle of the 20th century, the entire industry was basically defunct.

Most would say that higher education has played a significant role in the development of the 20th century's post-industrial economy. It too employs millions, owns enormous facilities, and has its share of associations. Could it too become defunct by the middle of the next century?

What killed the railways was not the automobile, the interstate highway system, or liberalized trucking regulations. "What killed

the railways was that they were run by people who really liked choo-choos," writes J. Ian Morrison in a recent article titled "Railways of the Nineties," in *Healthcare Forum Journal.* The folks who ran them (railways) loved the trains so much they couldn't conceive why anyone would want to drive, fly, or truck. And although Morrison was writing about hospitals, what he says could equally apply to colleges and universities. The problem is that both higher education and hospitals are run by people fascinated with big buildings and all they contain. Ahhh, the problem with paradigms. We have become conditioned to think that the physical campus is the university. It is difficult for us to conceive of any other way to convey knowledge other than within the traditional college campuses, which are devoid of the tawdry elements of commercialism, industry, and government. These special places are our sanctuaries of learning.

But change is underway. Although it might be difficult for us to perceive since we are caught in the middle of it, the signs are quite evident. Some futurists predict that as early as the year 2000, only 20 percent of our students will actually be enrolled in a traditional four-year, full-time program at one of our traditional campuses. At this very moment, students and their parents are incurring huge debts so that they can attend one of our special places of education. Many segments of society are openly questioning the value of this investment. At the same time, discussion of options swirl around us, including long-distance learning, electronic media, and a bachelor degree in three years or less!

Yet what are we, the professional facilities managers of higher education, doing to help our industry confront and eventually evolve to this new paradigm? How are we helping our presidents, our business officers, and our trustees prepare for a future where we may not have the financial wherewithal to keep all of our existing buildings in operation? Or where higher education needs less space, not more. And where our beloved Old Main will be as obsolete as the railway industry's steam locomotive, and will likely share the same fate regardless of the facility administrators' efforts

to preserve them into perpetuity. Will our professional associations help provide us with the information, ideas, and connections that can equip us with the tools and strategies necessary to deal with change? Will they help us prepare for this future even though the pace of change and the details of this future environment are yet difficult to discern? Are they now raising questions, researching answers, and helping the higher education enterprise understand the dimensions of its current financial and facilities problems, the explosive impact of technology, or the implications if some of the futurist's predictions prove accurate?

Such a role, if it is fulfilled, is truly the role of leadership. It is the attempt to seek answers to questions before the question itself is asked. It is the process of convincing people to develop skills that they don't need today, but will need tomorrow. It is the willingness to take risks and to suffer the criticism from those who are now deeply entrenched in the old paradigm. This is the stuff that inspires people to experiment, to take chances, and to embrace change, not resent it.

This is a role that is important to our profession, the success of our association, and most importantly, the future of higher education. But it is not a role currently played by our association. And, for an increasing number of us who think of ourselves as the new breed of facilities manager, that is a problem.

Redefining Facilities Management

So what went wrong?

It's not that our recent assemblage of association presidents, their vice presidents, and our board members don't care and haven't tried to envision the future. It's not because some of our presenters at our annual meetings are boring, filling us with a lot of stuff irrelevant to the issues that I and others of my ilk face every day. And it has nothing to do with the quality of our association staff or of our various membership services, seminars, or publications.

It would be much easier if we could point to something that we as a profession or as an association have done wrong. That's one thing physical plant administrators are good at: fixin' problems!

No, the problem is much more enigmatic and complicated. It has nothing to do with deferred maintenance, customer focus, TQM, project management, or energy conservation. It doesn't even have to do with how well we build or maintain buildings. It has to do with a much more fundamental issue: the very disappearance of the job of physical plant administrator and the emergence of the need for facilities management. You see, the rules have changed and nobody told us.

There are many folks who still haven't figured this out. They think that the change is just semantics. They reason that all you have to do is change the name of the physical plant department to Facilities Management and keep doing the same things you always did. But the fact is that while colleges still need their buildings built and maintained, they need more— they also need someone to manage facilities. And the type of facilities management they need is a lot different than what we have been doing for the past three decades.

No, the culprit is much more fundamental: higher education itself is changing. Just like the watch industry changed with the advent of electronic quartz technology, higher education is also being reshaped in the face of several inexorable and dynamic forces, albeit less dramatically and more slowly. And so too, we who specialize in facilities have a clear choice. We can react to the changes as did the Swiss watch industry. We can attempt to deny the implications of these changes as just a cheap imitation, tawdry commercialism, or the product of a business decision. If so, I suspect our fate and the fate of our association will closely parallel that of the Swiss watchmakers.

What are these forces and why do they affect the way we need to manage facilities? Generally the primary culprits are changes in society, technology, and economics.

Forces For Change

Our society is evolving in many directions. Factors such as diversity, population growth, family structure, moral values, graying baby boomers, and a host of others are affecting not only who is educated, but how we educate them. This has spawned multi-campus operations, storefront colleges, a burgeoning community college system, conference centers/hotels, extension courses, shared multi-use facilities, elderhostel, college abroad, part-time faculty, ad hoc faculty, visiting professors and researchers. Need I go on? All of this affects the type of facilities needed to support education as well as the background and orientation of those individuals called upon to devise the means to accommodate such programs.

Then there is technology. Laboratories are much different today than they were twenty years ago. At many institutions we are abandoning laboratory buildings that were built in the 1950s and 1960s because we can't economically update them to meet modern requirements. The campus library is being replaced by the learning center, with its stacks sized to accommodate optical disks, not books. Networks, environmental control, biological containment, and isolated foundations are now routine concepts in the lexicon of facilities management.

And finally, economics. Economics is not the great equalizer, but instead is the great fragmenter and segmenter of higher education. It differentiates the type and quality of education between public and private, rich and poor, research and liberal education, downtown and suburban, and state-of-the-art or obsolete. It also affects the demand for education based on the need for and types of careers one can get out of a particular field of study. This also means that the type of facilities problems that will routinely surface at a major research university will be quite different from the problems occurring at a small, rural liberal arts college. In addition, higher education itself will likely continue to find that the competition for limited resources will increase, not diminish. This means

that traditional approaches to soliciting resources, especially for capital intensive needs such as facilities, will become less and less fruitful. This single issue alone will drive the search for new and unconventional methods of educating our populace. Waiting for some future payday to bail the college out of its facilities problems will not only be risky, but downright deadly.

The New Era Facilities Manager

The facilities manager required by higher education in the future is not just a new improved and repackaged version of the former director of physical plant. In fact, physical plant administrators, while in their own right quite important to the successful operation of a college campus, will be but one member of a facilities manager's team. The facilities manager will operate in an environment set apart from shops, suppliers, factories, and architect's design rooms. The facilities manager will instead have to be comfortable making presentations or striking deals in the board rooms and meeting rooms of accountants, bankers, attorneys, real estate developers, construction executives, politicians, and college trustees. They will be equally comfortable in the offices of the president and the deans, or in a meeting of the faculty senate. They will operate in this environment, not because they have been invited but because (1) they are responsible for pursuing facilities solutions for their college or university, and (2) there isn't going to be anybody else in the university's administration who understands the multitudinous elements involved in these new approaches and solutions.

To navigate successfully the full spectrum of facilities issues, the prerequisite toolbox of skills will be much different from what has previously been required. Some of the major differences between the past and the future facilities manager include the following:

1. *Strategic Planning.* Facilities managers need to be able to visualize the big picture and then synthesize strategies on how best to meet the requirements for facilities. The identification

of the full range of potential solutions to a problem, their systematic and thorough evaluation, and a concise, understandable presentation of a recommendation is just part of it. Defining the problem correctly is the first and most important component of problem solving. Since a facilities manager understands the long-term cost liabilities associated with a bricks-and-mortar type solution, they will seek to examine other alternatives such as policy changes, better utilization of existing facilities, on short-term measures until other events reduce or eliminate the problem. This is the skill of thinking strategically, not just tactically, and it will be a key ingredient in how facilities managers view the world and their institution's place in it.

2. *Executive Level Skills.* To play in their league you have to walk the walk and talk the talk. When dealing with executive level decision makers, the 300-page report with appendices will not do. Somehow that report must be condensed down to a one-page executive summary that covers the issues, the bottom line, and why the recommended solution is the best. Furthermore it has to be presented in ten to twenty minutes, otherwise you will lose everybody and find yourself going back to study it some more. Finally, the question and discussion period following the formal presentation must convince the decision makers that the required thoroughness in analysis and staff work has been done. This requires the ability to anticipate concerns and issues facing the institution— financially, politically, and programmatically— and to ensure that they are addressed as part of the executive decision-making process.

3. *Experimentation.* Higher education's future facilities manager will have to be prepared to run counter to the well-entrenched conventional thinking prevalent in these staid and conservatively run institutions. Overcoming the predominant tendency to further expand and build without considering its implications will require vision and a good dose of tenacity.

The favorite question of college administrators and trustees, "Has this been tried anywhere else before?" will need to be dealt with in the absence of being able to assure them that other colleges are doing or have done it before. This will require skills in introducing change in organizations. It means knowing how to develop a process of very small steps toward change that, when taken together, represent a very large leap. The ability and willingness to attempt this experimentation will form the breakthrough innovation so necessary to new facilities management techniques and models, and the future success of higher education.

4. *Networking.* "Best of class" or "best of practice" are terms associated with the processes of continuous quality improvement. Yet how do we know what is best practice if we do not communicate with the outside world? Writing in *Business Blindspots,* Benjamin Gilad attributes the troubles at many of our major corporations, such as GM, Kodak, and IBM, to competitive sclerosis– a disease that takes executives who have been extremely successful for many years and turns them blind to reality. For the facilities manager, benchmarking operations, testing how others are doing with their experimentation, and learning from other failures are part and parcel to good management. This means the willingness and ability to reach out and share information, as well as the ability to work collaboratively with peers at other institutions or in other industries. Part attitude and part skill, it represents the desire to constantly know how others are doing it and how one stands with respect to the competition.
5. *Institutional Uniqueness.* The facility needs of the research university are different from those of the small liberal arts college, which are quite different from those of the urban community college. While bricks are bricks and we probably all use similar light bulbs, the conditions, demands, and use of facilities are much different from institution to institution. Therefore, while facilities managers may have a common

goal– finding the best facilities portfolio that maximizes the goals of the institution– the range of solutions in that portfolio will be matched to the type of institution it is. This means that the profession of facilities management will become increasingly segmented, following the same trend as the institutions themselves. The required skill, skill level, information requirements, and sphere of interests will be markedly different for facilities managers, dependent on the type of institution they find themselves in, although they will all share the same title and all belong to the same association.

Or will they? Will the new era of facilities managers find relevancy in the programs that served physical plant administrators so well during the past three decades? Will they be attracted to participate, to contribute to our knowledge and the level of practice. For so many years, this past involvement has represented the real strength of APPA. Or is APPA doomed to decline because its products and services no longer truly address the issues of modern facilities management?

At the Crossroads

Some of us think that our association is at a critical juncture in its history. Perhaps the very things that led to APPA's past successes have created the conditions for its potential decline in the future. Some possible reasons:

- Preoccupation with Maintenance. For years the primary focus of APPA and that of the majority of its members has been directed toward the methods of building or renovating buildings, and then maintaining them. While this has been a major portion of the physical plant *raison d'etre*, it has crowded out almost every other aspect of the facilities management agenda within APPA. We have learned how to maximize, optimize, measure, critique, and reenergize maintenance, whether it be routine, deferred, emergency, or just about any other brand of it. Perhaps we have exhausted this aspect of facilities and need to consciously

work at the other elements. That might mean having our members speak at other associations' conferences about the area we have developed so well and inviting those from other associations to talk about that which we need to learn more about.

- Members Needs. During the development of APPA's current long-range plan, debates arose about whether the association existed to meet its members needs or those of higher education itself. The debate arose because of the concept of institutional membership versus individual memberships. Several of us argued (unsuccessfully) that the association's energies should be directed toward anticipating and helping equip our membership to solve the facilities problems facing higher education. This role can be played by an international association with the resources and time to look over the horizon at what may lay ahead. Defining the trends within higher education will not be determined through member surveys. Instead, this requires constant questioning and discussion with others involved in the future of higher education. This includes such entities as the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, as well as public policy makers and think tanks such as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Organizational Paralysis. Our representational organizational structure is great for leveling demands and, as some might argue, trying to make APPA all things to all people. Our type of organization, with regions that replicate the international structure, tends to promote conditions in which the established leadership tries to perpetuate itself. Therefore, there is a tendency in such organizations to see the same people serve repeatedly on almost every conceivable committee assignment, at the regional and then at the international level. This observation is not intended to be judgmental. It is only intended to point out that a consequence of this structure is the tendency to create a "good old boy" network. You end up having a relatively small group of individuals dictate what it thinks is in the best in-

terests of the membership. As a result, many innovative or controversial ideas are dismissed before they ever see the light of day or the ears of the membership. This is what I call organizational paralysis. It is the very inability of the organizational structure to permit, let alone promote, any idea or proposal that is not in line with the leadership's perception of the association's values or sphere of interests. This is not unique to APPA, but in recognizing this tendency, measures should be explored to mitigate its influence. One measure might be the creation of the association's own think tank with membership based on some criteria other than time served in committee work or offices held.

- Leadership Anemia. On a similar note, our organizational structure also tends to create what might be called leadership anemia. Because our presidents only serve a one-year term, they have at best two years to establish a direction, convince the organization this is a worthy goal, and then try to mobilize resources to actually achieve some progress toward that goal. Realizing this is practically impossible, most of our recent presidents have attempted to pick a single issue and devote their energy toward its solution. Since most of the issues facing higher education are going to require significant energy and protracted effort, our association is unlikely to benefit from one of the cornerstones of leadership: a leader! We need to revisit our elected officer arrangement. Perhaps a structure where the president is appointed and serves a multi-year term with only the board and its chairperson being elected annually, would better serve the cause of leadership.
- Vision. Perhaps the most serious single deficiency in any organization is the lack of a unifying vision of what they are and what role they should play. Regarding our role within higher education, APPA's current mission statement is nice, but frankly, it is unclear and uninspiring. Our vision should be worthy of the very mission of higher education itself. It should say specifically what makes us, and what we do, essential to the future success of our institutions.

> This is heady stuff, and I will not be so bold as to suggest what that vision should be. (I will say that I believe a vision is to devise facilities strategies that will enhance the goals of education, not do all those other things we currently identify as our mission and vision.)

This treatise started on the premise that conditions were ripe for initiating a new phase in higher education's evolution. We discussed the factors that were forcing changes in the methods of managing higher education and its facilities. The likely effect that these changes could have on the role and practice of facilities management were also reviewed. We then summarized several reasons why our association was not providing the needed leadership at this critical juncture in facilities management. So now, what do we do?

Hopefully, the ideas discussed in this article will not end the dialogue about our future, but will elevate it to a higher level of consciousness. If so, then I will have accomplished my purpose. In the meantime, life goes on. Some will continue to seek ways to trim another penny off the cost of their custodial services; at the same time, I'll be trying to devise a strategy where we might avoid the cost altogether.

Power, Influence, and Survival in Difficult Times

by Mark Pastin

We are talking about power and influence today, and, mainly, I want to give you some fighting words. But before I do that, I want to share with you some thoughts on power that I've gathered over the years. Here's a Chinese proverb that you need to think about: "If we don't change directions, we'll end up where we're headed."

I've been reading some of the statistics gathered about where we are headed in terms of the physical facilities of our universities and colleges. Here's another great one:

"You can never plan the future by the past," Edmund Burke.

And: "Action may not always bring happiness, but there is no happiness without action," Benjamin Disraeli. That's a lot of what I'm going to talk about. Here's a great one; I attribute this quote to God: "Complain to someone who can do something about it or shut up."

But this talk is going to be built around one final quote, and this is from Henry Luce, who was chairman and chief executive of

Time, Inc. He said, "In life, there are no permanent victories or solutions. To win is to stay committed and maneuver."

I'm going to talk to you about winning in facilities management because, generally speaking, we are not winning today. I'm not going to repeat the sorry statistics on deferred maintenance and capital renewal, which you know much better than I do. I want you to consider a few things.

Higher education is the only major U.S. industry not making a record commitment to plant and equipment today. Across this country, people have realized that competing in the international environment requires constant reinvestment in plant and equipment. You're in one of the few industries not deeply concerned about providing the highest quality physical environment for its customers. The customer really is king today, and we must recognize that the customer judges both the service itself and the physical environment in which it is presented.

You're in one of the few industries not making massive investments in anticipation of stricter environmental regulation and enforcement. We are in the environment decade, and industry is really investing in anticipation of where this is going. By and large, we in higher education are not investing at that level. We are in an industry that doesn't realize that a superior physical plant provides a sharp competitive advantage over low-cost, low-quality competitors, and that is part of what the competitive game is about today.

We're in an industry in which money is galloping away from us, and our leaders have been reduced, frankly, to begging. I'm not saying this to discourage you. There is no point in getting discouraged in anything you do in life. But I am saying this because we have a crisis in higher education today, and, by and large, the facilities management function is not winning.

I don't want to ask you how bad it is but, rather, what will it take to change this, to exercise some power to influence and not merely survive?

Facilities officers can strengthen their positions not at the expense of their institutions, but instead on behalf of their institutions.

I'm going to give you some ideas about how to do this, and I'll start with one that should be very obvious.

I've had the chance to observe APPA over the past three years, and I will tell you that it is an excellent, constantly improving organization. Some of the things I've seen are the name change to add prestige to the profession and some very strategically important studies. I'm not a great believer in studies for the purpose of printing paper, but APPA's studies really support the mission of higher education. The Facilities Management Evaluation Program is an important service, and one that will make a big difference in the profession. And of course, public and government relations is an area in which your field will see vastly growing needs. Power by association is important in gaining influence within your own institutions.

You've made a lot of progress, but I want you to stop and think about the next phase. What is the next phase for APPA as an association? From my distant and less-involved perspective, I'm going to urge you to continue what you're doing. But I think the time has come to play much, much tougher. If you please, the gloves have got to come off.

To win at the level of association, there are some things you are going to have to think about doing. One is focusing attention on the environmental and safety problems caused by deferred maintenance. We've been too polite about this. As part of the education establishment, it's time to take your cue from other campus interest groups. Who of us has not sat in wonder as the real need goes unmet while the squeaky wheel of the day attracts resources? That's a fact of life. It is time to learn from special interests who are highly effective in the institutions in which we operate.

It's time to start creating awareness of the environmental impact of these things by using the tools used in industry and by other associations. For example, environmental hotlines encourage people who see the effects of deferred maintenance or a lack of capital renewal to report environmental problems and help you build a record of what needs to be done. For facilities management as a

profession, there is the job of learning the regulation and litigation environments and using them. By and large, and it won't feel this way to you, higher education has gotten a "free pass" on the environment. Compared to the kind of litigation, regulation, and frankly, outright terror you see out there in the corporate world, we've gotten a free pass. But that free pass is in the process of being canceled. It's time to build even deeper alliance with the suppliers, regulators, and the media and to begin to use these alliances aggressively.

The things I'm talking about are extremely hazardous individual pursuits. They may be career killers. But they are highly effective association pursuits, and that's one of the reasons why people associate. There are things that need to be said that the individual cannot easily say. But the individual as part of an association gains voice.

I also want to focus some attention on what needs to happen at the individual level. Power and influence cluster together with leadership. And there is so much academic baloney on leadership that you need a wheelbarrow to carry the books around. But there are some things that I've observed that really work for people who are trying to increase their power and build influence. Remember that your job as a leader is to motivate or to influence, and also remember that the great motivators are unchanged: fear and greed. Much has changed in higher education and much has changed in the world, but not the basic human motivations of fear and greed. The strategies that work in power and influence, when you cut through the fancy-shmancy language, generally relate to fear and greed.

Here are some specific things that I think are important as you go forward.

One is to stick with your message. Of course the times are tough and it's hard to do this, but leaders win by sticking with their message even when the going gets tough. If what you're saying all along has been true, then it's still true. The fact that times are tough doesn't make the bricks and mortar need repair any less. There is

a lot of what I call noise in the environment now, a lot of pain, a lot of suffering, and a lot of interests competing with each other. But the noise may actually make it easier for a consistent message to get through. People tend to discount the noise when everybody's yammering. If, however, you're saying the same thing today that you were saying one year ago, two years ago, and you are saying the same thing a year from now, your credibility increases in this kind of an environment.

On the other hand, if you change your tune, if something that was critical and had to happen last year isn't so important this year, you'll have a hard time regaining your credibility. If it's true, it's still true and you ought to still be saying it.

The next point, and this is one I really want to drive home, is that you must operate from the stance that you can and will win. Many facilities officers assume that they really cannot win and, bluntly, it shows. The positions taken are soft, losses are graciously accepted, and altogether it doesn't work. This was brought home to me by a fellow who served as western regional human resources manager for Motorola. He was talking about why human resources people often have the ideas and knowledge to change their organizations but very seldom do. He said that it's because they never come from the position that they really can win on the things that matter. And it shows. Your position, your stance, will only prevail if you hold it in a context that says, "We can win, we need to win, we will win."

In measuring power and influence, there's a transaction that occurs when somebody looks in your eyes and asks, "Is this person negotiating, or is this person taking a real position?" Operate from the position that you can and will win.

The next point is to set the terms of debate. You cannot buy into the death-by-a-thousand-small-blows game; there is no winning in that game. You must argue your perspective first by the issues and then by the realities of the budget, never the other way around. There is no winning in 1 percent, 3 percent, 5 percent. My view is that the budget is gravity, and you can't change gravity. I'm sure

people in the early days of flight wanted to wish gravity away. But you cannot fly by standing on the ground and saying, "I wish there were no gravity because then I could fly." But you also don't fly by letting gravity depress you and hold you to the ground. You fly by designing the aircraft that will work given gravity. You think first about what it is that will work, and then you deal with gravity or with the budget. But you have to define your issues.

Align your staff with your plan. Teach your staff that the facilities perspective really can win. And know that if your team believes it can't win, then it can't. It can win, but only if the whole team continually sells that perspective. That means on a day-to-day basis, every day, explaining to people why things that should work, don't. If people don't understand why, then they blame you and they blame your team. Explain to people what the risks may be of not doing something the right way and what the long-term costs may be.

Let me share an experience. I have an office in a building that has one of the slowest elevators on Earth. There are two elevators in the building, and one of them is broken much of the time. I can't tell you how many times I've stood at the base of that elevator and heard people say, "When are those bozos from physical plant going to get over here and do something about this piece of junk? I'm fed up." One day we're in the elevator with a fellow from physical plant, and everybody is standing there with their arms folded thinking, "Okay, he finally showed up." And I said, "You know, it would be interesting to understand why we have so much trouble with this." And the fellow said, "Let me take a moment and explain." Then he held up a component and said, "This is a used, remachined component, and it's not quite to the specifications we want. But we're under orders, because of the budget, to remachine parts, and it's not so easy to do that. We know they're safe, but they're not the best they might be." Then some other people in the elevator said, "Yeah, we get that; we're up against the same problem. We're trying to run some numbers in our computer and our version of Lotus is ten years out of date." Suddenly, we were

on the same side. We understood the facilities management world a little bit better, but only because that person took the time, had the patience, and felt he had the right to discuss the problems as he saw them.

The academic environment is one in which you have very high volume, in the sense that people speak loudly, but there is little real communication. People are used to listening to themselves. They are used to writing articles that few will read and speaking to hostage audiences of kids who are locked in because they've got to get their final exam and their grade. Consistent, careful communication can pay big dividends in an environment in which people need communication and mutual understanding, because there is so little of it.

Your facilities staff is probably more of a team than any function on campus. Your interests really are shared. You sink or swim together. Build upon that sense and authorize people to talk and to support your function.

The next point is to identify issues on which those above you can win. True, people don't see that they can win by spending a lot of money and only being 10 percent behind. But the people to whom you report are trying to find issues on which they can win, because there aren't that many. So don't argue the incremental gains or losses. Argue the issues, the topics, the projects on which people can win. These issues might include things such as historic and sentimental renovations. People have a longing for things that are going away. Help them keep some of them. Advance approaches to environmental problems. Since we've got 98 percent of the world's environmental scientists on our campuses, administrators can win by showing that they want to be environmental leaders. You can help them.

Get people involved in their physical environment in ways that will help attract grants to a campus. How many people have taken the time to think about the extent to which a poor physical facility inhibits grant money? How many people have taken the time to learn what changes can be made to facilitate grant activity for the

campus? Believe me, this is something that the campus powers will listen to. You also want to look at things that will earn the school credit in the community. Most schools are a big factor in their communities, and the physical state of the school is also important to the community. Property values rise and fall with the physical quality of your campus. Get out there and raise those issues with the community.

If you create opportunities for your business officer or president to win even if they are not, in your professional opinion, the things most needed then the things that are most needed will follow. If you make somebody a winner, they are more inclined to meet your needs.

Think about the fact that your audience, the academic administrator, is more survival-oriented than progress-oriented. Frankly, you seldom make it as a university administrator by taking big risks and unpopular positions. You make it by getting the job done and keeping your head low. This means that you must advocate the real risks of environmental violations and safety issues, and the real embarrassment of compliance violations and waste problems. No university president can afford to be viewed as environmentally unconcerned. And the most direct aspect of environmental concern is one that you control.

Universities, as I mentioned earlier, have had a curiously easy time on environmental and safety issues, and, in fact, on other regulatory issues. Just to give you an idea of how this has changed, when I first became a professor I bought malpractice insurance, more as a joke than anything else. It cost five dollars a year. Today the only company that will sell malpractice insurance to a professor is Lloyds, and it costs two-and-a half times my annual salary. That's my risk exposure, as an individual, to litigation and regulation.

The idea that universities and colleges are polite places that don't have to play by the rules that everybody else has to play by are over. People are suing us, they're angry at us, they think we're just like anybody else. This will be the decade in which we get our regulatory comeuppance, and we're not going to like it.

For example, consider the 1991 Federal Sentencing Guidelines for Organizations. The guidelines raised fines for certain violations of the law by as much as ten times their previous levels, if the courts decide that one hasn't done an effective job of preventing violations. It's called the "culpability index." An extension of the sentencing guidelines dealing with environmental infractions was also issued. They raised fine levels across the board and added a multiplier of one to ten times for a lack of effective reporting and prevention. The guidelines apply to all organizations including universities. This is just one example of the fact that what we decide in-house may not be good enough anymore.

Both your position within higher education and external realities require that you begin playing hardball on safety and the environment. You're going to do yourself and your institution a favor by doing so. Remember, your audience is survival oriented. You don't survive by being environmentally irresponsible now, in 1997, or at any time from now on.

The last general point I want to make is to build alliances inside and outside the university and college. For the level of accomplishment and responsibility that facility officers have, most are virtually unknown on and off campus. This is a choice, and it may have been a good choice at one time, but it isn't today. Today the ding on the door of the vehicle gets fixed because it can be seen, but the oil isn't changed in the engine.

People on and off campus really do care. Get support on campus. Get support from your suppliers. Be involved in public events. Be involved in the community's concerns about your campus. Seek involvement where it's available. If you begin taking a higher profile and building alliances, and there's no reason not to, your interests will align with campus interests, with community interests, and with most regulatory interests. You may offend some, but it will also heighten awareness and build respect for you and the issues that you advocate. In today's environment of harsh competition for scarce resources, invisibility is not a winning strategy.

Let me review some of the points I've made.

1. You win by association. Learn what the special interests have learned: Campuses respond to sharply focused interests; become a focused interest yourself.
2. Stick with your message even in tough times. When others are waffling and vacillating, you may have your best chance to be heard. You have a solid message; it's real. Stick with it.
3. Operate from the stance that you can and will win. This is an important point. Leaders are more concerned about what it will take to win than about what will happen if they lose. As soon as you think about what will happen if you lose, you lose.

   There are many examples of this, the most famous is the Flying Walendas. Old Karl Walenda never had an accident until the last time he walked the high wire. It was the first time in his life when he didn't trust his team. He rechecked the fastenings on both ends of the wire, and when he was on that wire he looked again to see if everything was okay. He fell and died. Leaders aren't worried about what will happen if they lose; they're worried about what will happen when they win. You have to come from that position.
4. Set the terms of the debate. Define the issues first, and then react to the conditions. Don't react to the conditions and then define the issues. Determine the issues that you want to address over the next three to five years on your campus, and align your staff with the plan.
5. You have a team, so use it well. You've got something that very few people have, so use that team. Use it as an influence resource. Remember, you're on the same side as they are.
6. Find the issues and projects that will make winners of those to whom you report. Find some winners in the list of issues, things that people can get behind and get credit for. And ad-

vocate the realities of risk. If making winners plays to greed, then advocating the realities of risk plays to fear.

7. Finally, build alliances and be a consistent participant. Particularly on campuses, all you have to do is want to be involved and you are involved. Take advantage of some of the opportunities.

There should be nothing new in what I'm saying. But I am recommending a big change in approach. There is a rule in life and it's really true: no risk, no gain. In tough times you must certainly take risks or you will definitely lose. Of course, you might also lose if you take a risk. That's what makes risks exciting, that's what makes them invigorating, that's why they promote personal and organizational growth.

These really are not tough times. In other words, this isn't a bad time that's going to go away. My belief is that the economy and education are not in a recession. They're in an adjustment. We'll call this recession over when we're used to it. And incrementally, that's what's going on; we're getting used to it. Those big, high-paying, heavy-benefit, lifetime jobs aren't being manufactured. And the competition around the world isn't going away. Competition isn't getting less just because we want the recession to end. The deficit isn't getting paid off. This is going to be with us for a while. The days when campus needs would eventually get met because things eventually got better are over. There is no choice or alternative to advocating today, because otherwise it just won't get done. I predict a decade in which facilities officers will need to take a much more aggressive stance. Those who don't will eventually be blamed for the sorry state in which their campuses end up. In other words, the choice of keeping your head low is really not available. Those who really play have a chance to win, and it doesn't mean you necessarily will win if you take risks.

I want to conclude by going back to what I said at the beginning. "In life, there are no permanent victories or solutions. To win (and winning is good) is to stay committed and to maneuver." I have one final quote that you may enjoy thinking about. It is, "If you

can't say goodbye, you have no power." What that really means is that in tough times we may have to risk our jobs to have real power. We have to have that strength to admit that one of the values of associations is to give that strength to each other. I see a lot of friendship and a lot of affiliation within APPA, as well as a lot of opportunity for growth. It is very important to maintain those strengths as we move forward.

Productivity Improvement Means Being Mission Driven

by John J. Garnand

An executive with the Bell System contemplating its divestiture mused, "The future just isn't what it used to be!" He could not have been more to the point. Clearly, the way things will get done in the future is changing, and the rate of change is exponential, with quantum leaps, not incremental extensions. Change is pushing the envelope to find new and better ways to deliver all facets of the higher education experience more creatively, more effectively, and more efficiently, in short– to do more with less! The future will not be a linear extension of "what used to be." And that is precisely the management challenge of the future– to provide new and innovative forms of leadership and professionalism that enable and empower people to achieve their segment of the overall educational mission of each institution.

Background Assumptions

First, educational reform has thus far focused on the K-12 continuum; it is currently being driven by a new realization of the

competitive challenges facing society, and the need to improve educational delivery– especially in the inner cities.

Society is also becoming conscious of the need to look critically into higher education as an institution, where costs are burgeoning, classes are taught to hundreds of students at once, faculty are spread too thin with consequent instructional degradation, and facilities are strained or in need of replacement. When a family becomes conscious of the fact that a four-year degree will cost anywhere from $40,000 to more than $100,000 at some private institutions, they become more concerned and more critical of the value of their investment. Higher education has priced itself out of reach of some Americans, and expectations have risen proportionally, particularly when this investment does not guarantee a higher paying job as it did in generations past.

In the future, all aspects of higher education will come under more and more public scrutiny– from the quality of the faculty, staff, administration, and students, to the quality of the library and facilities. We must learn to achieve more with less– the same lesson that is permeating business in the United States.

Second, facilities management provides a unique service to each institution, because it is an infrastructure service. It deals with the physical aspects of the educational enterprise often taken for granted. In general, users are not conscious of the infrastructure unless there is a problem or a breakdown. For instance, we are not very conscious of the road on which we drive, unless it is full of potholes; similarly, we never think of the air conditioning and ventilation systems until they break down during a heat wave or the electrical system that powers our computers until a storm causes a power outage and everything shuts down, including the elevator in the building. We assume infrastructures will be operable and reliable.

But someone has to be on watch. Facilities managers must be continually concerned about the safe and smooth operation of the institution itself– the infrastructure– that everyone else takes for granted.

Two corollaries follow from this assumption. The first is the "squeaky wheel" syndrome. Facilities managers become the focus of complaints where notification is usually negative, and everything is a crisis such as when a toilet is overflowing into the classrooms in the chemistry building. The second corollary is that facilities professionals do their work without direct contact with the end user. They do not provide a direct service to a customer– who is appreciative or indifferent– but who is the user of the facility or service. Infrastructure professionals do not see who will drive over their bridges. Rather, their focus is on the structure or function itself, on the quality of the process and physical aspects of what they are designing, building, or repairing, and its promise of future functionality. They may never see the end users of their products. This requires a different type of motivation, professionalism, and leadership, in which intrinsic value must be derived from the actual doing of the project itself.

Third, most functions performed in the management of facilities are distributed (i.e., not performed in a centralized office, but performed at the job site). Many functions require employees to work unsupervised, and make judgment calls on the spot about how the work is to be done. This calls for a different paradigm of professionalism. Professionals do not work under strict and direct supervision; we count on professionals to perform individually yet adhere to the standards and quality of work demanded by the best in the profession. For example, we expect an ophthalmologist using a laser for eye surgery to focus on the procedure as if it were the only thing that is important– and to live up to the standards and requirements of the profession. Professionals work on their own, and are individually responsible for the results of their work. They have constant access to information from other professionals about the latest techniques and procedures; they meet to discuss methodologies, professional principles, and the highest standards of integrity. We count on professionals and trust them to do the job right. When a professional does not perform at this level, as in

the case of an inept surgeon, we feel more than angry; we feel betrayed because we held higher expectations for the professional.

But, professionals are made, not born. Professional competencies are so diverse they cannot be directly supervised. Close supervision is inefficient, as well as demeaning. As managers, we need to learn to be more comfortable "letting go" the control and direction of professionals– counting on them to deliver the job, and trusting them to make the many judgments required by each project.

Professionalism is a value, a way of doing things well, of doing things right. It is sensed by the individual as a pride of craftsmanship, as "job pride" or "work pride"– as having intrinsic value, in and of itself.

Finally, there is dignity in any work. We in the United States, perhaps because of the explosion of service and white collar jobs coupled by higher salaries these tend to receive, have a tendency to ascribe dignity to "clean" jobs– work that does not soil the appearance or require someone to go underground to repair a broken cable, or a broken water main. White collar jobs are those of physicians, professors, attorneys, bankers, executives. But upon reflection, the quality of the soldering job on the plumbing behind the drywall of the building may mean the difference between a functional and reliable infrastructure, or a horrible mess!

Similarly, a sleazy attorney can take on a meritless case, hoping to win by intimidating the other party into submission. Dignity is a value that is not inherent in what one does, but rather is commanded by how one does it. Dignity is a matter of style– reflecting both inner confidence and job pride. Dignity is a way about someone, not what they do.

Organizational Mission and Goals

I once heard a story about a Japanese general manager who was in charge of a large company subsidiary located in the United States. This person was surrounded by five or six American vice

presidents– constituting the officer cadre of the subsidiary. These persons were interviewed by a management consulting firm interested in researching the culture and adaptation of foreign firms in this country.

When the general manager was asked how he felt about managing the subsidiary, he indicated he was somewhat estranged from the home office, that he purchased a Japanese newspaper to keep informed, and that he traveled as often as he could back to Japan to find out what was going on. When asked about his American vice presidents, he was full of praise. He indicated they were loyal and hard working, and constituted a superb management team. When queried about any weaknesses they exhibited, he thought for a minute and replied, "Well, they are not very good at setting goals."

The vice presidents were asked how they felt about working for a Japanese manager; they were very complimentary. They indicated he was a fair, hard-working individual, a strong no-nonsense leader, an ethical person, and a superior role model. When asked to comment about what they would like to see improved, they replied, "Well, he is not very good at setting goals."

Apples and oranges! The American vice presidents had all come up through the ranks in a U.S. business culture that focuses energy on achieving specific company objectives for which employees are held accountable. It takes the thinking out of the picture– just execute the plan. Identify for us a specific outcome, and we will deliver it– on time, and on budget. The only thing that counts is results.

Do not take this as a disparagement of goal setting; goals are very important to measure progress and achievement– very much like grades in school that reflect effort and performance. Almost every employer will ask a prospective employee whether he or she is "goal driven," with the anticipated affirmative answer. But goals carry you only so far. Goals "disappear" once they are achieved and must be replaced by new goals. If a student sets a goal "to be a millionaire by the time I am 30" and actually makes a million

dollars by age 28, the former goal is wiped away. Goals are specific benchmarks, set in time, that create extrinsic measures for accountability– to others, or to yourself. Goals specify: what, how much, by when.

The Japanese general manager, on the other hand was groomed in a culture that focuses on understanding the purpose and mind-set of the organization. His analysis goes to the heart of the company. He knows that any employee who understands and accepts the "soul" of the company can be counted on to make judgments that are consonant with that direction. Employees who internalize the mission and purpose of the organization do not need to have goals. Everything they do will reflect the purpose and values of the organization. The general manager was really referring to the mission of the organization.

Contrary to goals that disappear when they are achieved, the mission of the organization is never achieved. The mission of the organization is like a compass– directional. Mission is measured by whether or not it is being "lived up to." People are evaluated by how closely their behavior aligns with the mission direction. Mission can be modified over time by new circumstances, but its key characteristic remains the same– it sets the direction for the organization.

Thoughts on Mission

It has always been a mystery to me how very few organizations really explore why they do what they do. Examples abound. Most organizations have only a cursory idea of their purpose– perhaps in terms of the bottom line, such as "to make a profit." But, as Professor Theodore Levitt said, "This makes about as much sense as saying the purpose of life is to eat!" The tail does not wag the dog.

Three observations about mission statements:

1. Mission statements create intrinsic values.

In his book, *Principle Centered Leadership*, Stephen Covey provides the example of the personal mission statement of his family:

> *The mission of our family is to create a nurturing place of order, truth, love, happiness, and relaxation and to provide opportunities for each person to become responsibly independent and effectively interdependent in order to serve worthy purposes in society.*

This is more than an affirmation of the family community. It is their mutual commitment to each other; it is why they bond together.

Interestingly, each element of the mission creates value for each of the members. To the extent that the family values this mission, each one in the family commits to the acceptance and achievement of each value. Envision a situation in which a young boy in the family is waiting for dad to get home from work so he can pitch a baseball to him. Dad straggles in, exhausted; the young boy catches him at the front door and asks him to play ball. Dad begs off for an hour to relax and unwind from a hard day at work. The young son realizes that this family community is committed to the value of "relaxation" and agrees to wait until dad has recovered. It is more than courtesy; it is living out the mission of the family. The boy's older sister comes home an hour after curfew from a date; dad and mom are waiting for her. Caught red-handed! She knows and is committed to the mission value of "truth"– she doesn't try to excuse the tardiness. She is grounded for two weeks. She knows the inconvenience she will experience and perhaps some "ribbing" at school is the price of character, and the personification of the mission of the family. Mission creates values.

2. If the mission and values of the organization are internalized, they empower.

Back to the story of the Japanese general manager. He knows that if an employee accepts and internalizes the mission of the organization, he can *count on the employee* to make judgments

consistent with the purpose and direction of the organization. In fact, internalization of the mission and values of the organization or profession is the only way to empower employees to "take charge" of situations as they occur, or "own" the situation. Employee "ownership" is the motivational paradigm of the 1990s. Stephen Covey cites an instance when he was lodging at a Marriott Hotel during a conference. He happened to need some markers for his presentation. Rushing out into the hall, he spotted a uniformed employee of the hotel. He asked the employee for assistance. It was given. Later, Covey met this employee and asked him for an explanation. The employee referred him to his individualized mission statement, which underscored the imperative of customer service and satisfaction, and which included decision rules like: "Never point, always escort," and "If a customer comes to you with a problem, you *own* that problem– solve it." This is corporate license for empowerment.

3. Mission statements should be individualized, not left at a macro organizational level.

We have a misconception about the mission of the organization– that there is only one corporate mission and everyone has to conform. This is one reason why we are cynical about the effectiveness of the mission statement– it is rhetoric. It sounds good but nobody enforces or really believes management is serious about living it. Each contributing member of the organization must function with a written, or inferred, concept of what the organization is about, and what their role/contribution means within it. Understanding the mission of the institution is critical for those who contribute to the infrastructure of the institution. Otherwise, it does not make sense. There is no forest; there are only trees.

When Ford Motor Company decrees that "Quality is Job One!," each member of the organization has to figure out what that means with respect to his or her role and the value he or she adds to the enterprise. The quality added by someone in the accounting department may focus on accuracy and reliability of the reports

they generated, whereas the value added by someone in manufacturing may be quite different. "Quality" is still "Job One!" but quality means different things to each employee. So, it follows that the organizational mission still stands, but must be individualized for each contributor. There is still a need for alignment, but there is a vast range of variation for each professional's mission. In the instance where an organization utilizes work teams, this alignment becomes even more imperative. Interpreting the corporate mission at a team level is more than aligning goals and procedures; it is empowering the team to make judgments about how the work will best be accomplished, always realizing why it is being done in the first place. For infrastructure projects, it is the only way to see the big picture, where the sum of the trees equals a forest.

Individualizing the mission to the work team creates a *value* for the outcomes of team productivity. It creates the elusive DNA we call "team synergy." We can all describe a shift of momentum in sports: one side was dominating but now the momentum has shifted. Momentum is hard to measure– but it is readily "sensed." A coach who cannot pick up shifts in momentum will not succeed in the long run. Momentum, and team synergy, are intangibles, but crucial for success in work settings involving teams. And the way to achieve synergy is to experience shared values, shared commitment to outcomes in other words, to share the mission of the organization.

In the local Rocky Mountain area we are occasionally beset by very strong snow storms that make travel hazardous or even impassable. The state government, in a laudable effort to ease congestion on the feeder freeways, occasionally will make the announcement that "nonessential state employees need not report to work" that day. Nonessential? I know what they mean, but think how you would feel if you were characterized by your employer as "nonessential?" I am not sure nonessential employees should even have a job! The fundamental requisite for employees to add value and contribute to the organization is the inner sense of meaning that comes from the knowledge that what they are

doing is important, and is not taken for granted. This is what "job pride" means. There is no value to be added, nor meaning to be derived, from feeling disenfranchised, from feeling "nonessential." Job pride is what a professional feels when he or she is living out the mission of the profession, or the mission of the organization. Job pride feeds on itself– nourishing and empowering itself. Job pride gives intrinsic value to work.

Let's put this all together.

We are all engaged in sustaining a community of scholarship– a "knowledge enterprise." Everything we do must point toward, contribute to, sustain, and celebrate that end. The "knowledge enterprise community" is the True North, towards which all compasses must be directed. Each work unit mission, each individual's mission is measured by its congruence and contribution to this direction.

Qualities that may characterize our use of tools and equipment might include such descriptors as keeping equipment clean and serviceable, not losing or stealing equipment, and safety. Safe use must become second nature, but always conscious. Unsafe actions seem to occur when a worker is careless, or tries to use the wrong tool to save time; neither of these excuses reflect quality, or professionalism. The surgeon working on your eye does not substitute a penknife for the laser that has momentarily lost power; the physician will postpone the continuance of the operation, rather than use the wrong tool for the sake of expediency. Unsafe actions must be avoided at all cost; there is no expedient justification to compromise safety. Respecting tools and equipment as they were designed, and caring for them, is really a measure of our sense of professionalism.

We work with and on tangible physical objects: buildings, conduit, floors, paint, brooms. Qualities of our work might be stated in terms of functionality of the facilities, reliability, aesthetics. We should talk about beauty, cleanliness, motif, style– all important attributes of the physical facilities– that contribute to

making the knowledge experience more enriching for the community.

But all of this is just background to the task. It makes us begin to think broadly about the value we add. Now let's be specific.

A Three-Step Process to Write a Mission Statement

Step One. Start by brainstorming about the meaning of job pride. Identify the values necessary to achieve the inner sense of fulfillment that instills job pride or a sense of professionalism. Ask what it means in the context of the work of the unit. Identify the values the unit holds that nurture and constitute job pride. Keep asking why these values lead to job pride.

Step Two. The key to writing a mission statement is to first identify the values we associate with our work; the way to identify these values is to find the soul or essence of the activity. List and prioritize the values leading to professional outcomes of the work of the unit. Try to identify the emotional content of the job, the passion of doing the job well, doing it right. We all work with our heads, our hands, and our hearts. What do we have to know? What technique or procedure do we follow? What excites us and makes us enthusiastic about our work?

Step Three. Ask the unit to write a mission statement for the work group (or the individual) that incorporates the values listed. Stay away from values that do not inspire or do not evoke a personal response (i.e., values such as "productivity" or "efficiency" do not inspire much emotion; they might have some meaning for administrators, but they hardly sustain a person's commitment, or energy). Also, the language should be vivid, so employees can develop a visual image in their heads.

Make the draft statement bold, exciting, and emotionally charged. A mission should drive the heart as well as the head. Merck is a pharmaceutical corporation that has been listed at the top of "America's Most Valuable" corporations, and is considered

by many to be a great place to work. Merck's mission statement (1989) begins as follows:

> *We are in the business of preserving and improving human life. All our actions must be measured by our success in achieving this end.*

The corporate mission then goes on to delineate what this means. But the point is clear: a mission must transcend the mundane, express the vision the organization holds for professionalism, reflect the values held by the work unit, and inspire individuals to behave in ways that embody and give life to those values.

Quality is everybody's "Job One."

Conclusion

Although I firmly believe it is imperative that each work unit expend the time, resources, and energy to work their way through the process outlined, and develop their own mission statement, I would be remiss if I did not leave you with a draft mission statement for your consideration:

> *The mission of the facilities management professional is to design, implement, and maintain the physical infrastructure to enable the fulfillment of the knowledge community enterprise, reflecting his or her stewardship of the public trust endowed by the citizens of the state on this institution. The facilities management professional respects the roles and contributions of students, faculty, administrators, staff, and alumni by providing a functional, reliable, safe, and aesthetic environment for the community's mission to be realized. Job Pride is Job One!*

The mission has to create more than value, it has to create professional meaning for each employee. They have to relate to it as a life theme, a life principle. They need to want to enact their mission. They will then see work with new eyes.

Strengthening the Role of Facilities Management in a Small Institution

by Keith H. Lovin

After three years as president of Maryville University, I have acquired a new perspective on, and certainly a renewed and deeper appreciation for, the role of facility managers. Let me put it as simply as I can. You are, quite simply and quite literally, as key to your institution and as important to your president as any other person, any other vice president or dean, anybody in the institution.

The long-term well-being of your institution depends in substantial ways upon your work and your leadership. You are the custodians of our capital assets, which in turn house our academic programs, athletic facilities, and all the rest. And it is these programs and activities that produce the intellectual, social, moral, and personal capital that we are in business to nurture and cultivate.

While it may be the quality of the academic programs and the quality of the faculty that attracts students to a campus initially, it is the quality of the environment, and the quality of the physical

plant, its buildings and grounds, that plays a major role in keeping them there. With the competition for students as keen as it is today, it certainly is in our best interests to retain students once we have attracted them to campus in the first place.

There is no doubt in my mind that the appearance of the campus and the grounds have a disproportionate effect on prospective students and their parents, not to mention, of course, prospective benefactors. Countless times over the years, parents have talked with me about their son's and daughter's selection of a college, and have cited the appearance of the campus as a major, and sometimes the major, factor. And if all things are equal, it certainly will tip the scale. When you think about it, it really stands to reason that this would be the case. The three institutions that I was privileged to study at were places where I felt a great deal of pride and satisfaction because of the physical appearance of the campus. I would imagine that if you reflected on the places that you attended, you would feel the same way.

Moreover, the appearance of the campus and its grounds, along with the way that students are greeted and treated by everybody on campus, have an enormous influence on the institution's image and its reputation than the "objective quality" of its academic programs.

I am aware that these are very difficult times on most campuses. Severe cutbacks have taken place on top of years of underfunding. There are many states in which there is not only no money for needed new capital construction or major renovation, there is no money to deal with serious problems like asbestos removal. In some state institutions there are legislative appropriations only for the most extreme emergencies. And, of course, in private institutions we have no legislature to turn to, even in case of emergencies, thereby facing the challenge of having to generate sufficient operating funds to take care of our work during any given year, as well as generating the reserves to handle new capital construction and to deal with the inevitable emergencies that come our way.

In addition to the budget cuts that most of you have experienced, you are faced with costs that are attendant to the significant new compliance requirements, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act. You must find ways to accommodate what in many institutions are short-term financial policies that have caused deferred maintenance to accelerate at an alarming rate. Your work has been made more difficult still, because apart from new construction or major new renovation, there is no sex appeal in, and hence no media attention given to, simply maintaining and preserving beautiful buildings and grounds. You also must constantly contend with the great pressure to put more resources, both fiscal and human, into the teaching and the research side of the institution.

All of these things, and more besides, make your job simultaneously more difficult and more important. More difficult because the people, the equipment, and the resources that you need to do your work are harder to come by. More important because it is your knowledge and your leadership that is required to steer us through these difficulties and to help us avoid the crises that some institutions are facing from coast to coast. I am sure you are aware that there are institutions facing annual budget deficits of $50 million to $100 million. We are talking about serious problems indeed.

Now, if you have a significant leadership responsibility here, how can you best start exercising it? Under what conditions could you best influence your institution in general, and your president in particular? I offer the following comments not as wisdom drawn from years of experience, but from the perspective of one president in office one year. I offer them also as a president who has had the extreme good fortune of having a director of physical plant and a facilities staff that I would not trade for any director or any staff in the United States of America.

It is critical that there be a good relationship between the president and the director of physical facilities. I suggest that you make the president know just how important, indeed just how

indispensable, you really are in promoting the institution's long-term well-being. Help your president understand that whatever the institution's mission is, your operation is critical to its realization. And if you can become friends with the president in the process, so much the better. The closer and more genuine the relationship that you enjoy with your president, the greater the opportunity that you will have to help educate and influence him or her about the importance of taking the long-term view. Remember, there is always great pressure on the president to spend more money in all areas of the institution. It is sometimes easier, it seems, to allow the facilities department to take the bigger hit, because it is not always as immediately noticeable. But long-term, I think that is very unwise.

I am convinced that it is this pressure, along with the shortage of funds, that has given rise to one of the most serious and difficult problems facing all of higher education— deferred maintenance. The problem quite literally has reached crisis proportions, and we must somehow work together to find ways to replace the short-term financial policies that are in effect in so many places with long-term policies. We must recognize that too many instances of deferred maintenance over too many years will result in the inevitable deterioration of the institution, if not its eventual demise. You need to take an active leadership role in helping the vice president to whom you report, and the president, understand this.

Of course, you must have a president who understands and appreciates the long-term view if you are going to be successful. I doubt that you disagree with this, but you may wonder how to get close to the president and how to exercise this influence. So much of this is a matter of style and personality. What will work in one place will not work in another. I will have to leave that to your own intuition and your own judgment. But there are some things that I think will be helpful and will influence your situation, regardless of the disposition of your president.

First, there is no substitute for knowledge, and there is no substitute for experience. If you do not truly and thoroughly

understand your job in all of its diversity and all of its complexity, then you cannot influence your president, at least not favorably. I remember the first time that I complimented Maryville's facilities director on the sparkling quality of our campus, grounds, and buildings. Instead of saying "Thank you" and moving on, or scratching his head and saying "Aw, shucks," he responded by quoting from the Carnegie Foundation report about the importance of physical facilities in carrying out the academic enterprise of the institution, and he later sent me a copy of relevant portions of that report. I want to tell you that he could not have done better, because this demonstrated context. It showed me in a powerful and effective way that he has more than just technical knowledge and understanding; indeed he understands the phenomenon of higher education itself.

Go to meetings, attend seminars, read the literature, keep up in your field, be an expert in your area. But if you really want to influence your president, and if you really want to have a lasting effect on your institution, then you need to make it your business to understand the business of higher education in the larger sense. Remember that you are the experts to whom others will look for leadership. When the opportunity presents itself, demonstrate your technical expertise and competence, but do so in the context of the purposes, and the values of higher education in general, and your own institution's mission in particular.

Second, assemble a good team. Next to your own competence, your greatest challenge is hiring the people who can help you execute your responsibilities and fulfill your role at the university. No place is any better than the people who populate it. I suppose everybody assents to this in the abstract, but it never ceases to amaze me how little we seem to internalize that truth. But if you want your operation to make a significant difference, then you had better not forget it when you hire people.

When you hire people, invest the time to find those people who have the skills that you need in the present. But also find the people who have the capacity to grow and develop and thereby help meet

your needs in the future. Also important is to try to get a sense of the person's attitude, how well that person will integrate into your team, the kind of cooperation that you can expect, the attitude that he or she will bring to the office and to work each day.

We can do a much better job in this area. After watching the way we fill position vacancies for twenty-five years, I have concluded that it is frequently done with little care or attention and is followed by consequences ranging from mediocre to disastrous.

Fortunately, I have seen the kind of staff that our director has assembled. The assistant director of our physical plant for buildings and grounds has an MFA degree. That is a pretty good preparation for bringing the kind of aesthetic understanding that is desirable on campus. Our assistant director for technical services is an absolute whiz in energy conservation. We have a team of people assembled in part because of their expertise, but also in part because of their attitude and cooperation– the way they work with each other and get along with each other. It makes all the difference in the world. If I had a magic button to push and could generate the same kind of attitude, the same kind of cooperation, in all other areas of the university, I would push that button in one instant.

Third, after you have assembled your team, educate them. They need to understand their role in the institution, and they need to be supported in fulfilling it. Sometimes we act as if it is only the faculty or the senior administrators who need continuing education. If we are to prosper in an institution, then we have to create an environment in which everyone may and does continue to learn. It is your responsibility to find ways to teach them.

Years ago, after a celebrated international career on the stage, the world famous violinist, Jascha Heifetz became a professor of music at UCLA. When someone asked him why he had left the glamorous world of performance to become a teacher, he said, "Violin playing is a perishable art. It must be pursued and passed on, otherwise it is lost." I submit to you that your work is a

perishable art, and you need to teach your team how to accomplish that work.

Fourth, consciously and deliberately think of yourself as the manager of a large and complex operation, because that is exactly what you are. This means that you have to hone your skills in long-range planning, financial management, team development, motivation and evaluation, priority setting, and communication, both within and outside your shop. Those things do not happen just by accident. When I walk into the facilities office on our campus, I am reminded of the television show "Hill Street Blues." Remember all of the chaos and confusion? Phones ringing off the wall, countless problems popping up large and small, emergencies that won't wait, disgruntled people, everybody thinking their problem is the most important, and all of this is on top of a regular caseload that in itself would fill up any day. And there was Captain Furillo in the middle of it all. He was making decisions, dispatching people, readjusting priorities, calming some people down, prodding employees to work harder, comforting others. It seems to me that your job is very much like that. That is the way it is on our campus, and the analogue of Captain Furillo is the director of facilities and the office manager. They are in there with good will and good humor dealing with all of this chaos, and it is both a beauty and a joy to watch.

Fifth, if you do not have a thick skin, I suggest you try to develop one. There are skeptics and critics everywhere. On the one hand, if you do your work when classes are in session, then you are totally insensitive to the interests of students and faculty members and the academic enterprise, disrupting it to serve your convenience only. And yet, if you wait until the summer break to do this work, it's because you and the senior management always wait until the faculty is away from campus to make decisions and spend money. You are not going to escape this, so learn to live with it and do not worry about it, because you cannot make everybody happy.

Somebody told the story of Robert Fulton who was showing off his new invention, the steamboat. People were gathered to watch

it, and the skeptics there were shouting, "It will never start! It will never start!" Finally, after a lot of clunking and chugging, it did start and began to make its way down the river. The skeptics looked at it for a while and then they started shouting, "It will never stop! It will never stop!" So do not worry about those people.

Sixth, because of the scarcity of resources, and this is not going to improve, you can impress and influence your president by being an innovative problem-solver. There was a great German chemist by the name of Johann von Baeyer who won a Nobel Prize for his many contributions to science. One day his assistants had developed an ingenious stirring device that was operated by water turbines. He was quite taken with that machine and eventually showed it to his wife. She looked at it for a while in admiration and then exclaimed, "Ah, what a lovely way of making mayonnaise!" You need to understand the difference between innovation and invention, and you need to find all kinds of ways for making mayonnaise.

I remember once when an architect visited campus. After lunch we were walking around campus, and I was talking about some of my fantasies and long-term dreams for the institution– trying to get a reading of whether it was doable or not. When all that was over I ran into the director of facilities and told him about it and a couple of problems that had come up. And he said, "Oh, this is how you can deal with that." When you find new ways to make mayonnaise, I guarantee you will impress your president.

Remember the words of Charles Kettering, who said, "The only difference between a solution and a problem is that people understand the solution." It is said that Thomas Edison had an interesting way of judging people. He would sometimes give applicants for positions a lightbulb, and he would ask them to determine how much water it could hold. So some of them would take a bulb and would determine the angles and make measurements to determine the surface area and then calculate the volume of water it would hold. Others would just fill it with water and pour

it into a measuring cup, taking only a few seconds. Edison was said to have preferred the latter. So do I.

Finally, because of your association with so many people, both on and off the campus, you have the opportunity to be a goodwill ambassador for your institution. Your association with, and the respect you command from, people in your community– architects, engineers, consultants, vendors, and contractors– it is critical in determining how your institution is perceived by the external world. Your president will rely on you in this area more than you will ever know. But in addition to that, on your own campus you have the opportunity to do something of extraordinary significance. You and your staff will come into contact every day with students, faculty members, legislators, trustees, prospective students, and parents of prospective students.

At Maryville we try to be a people-oriented university with a student orientation that is second to none. Now, given your contact with all of those I just mentioned, you have the opportunity to influence how people think and feel about the campus and about being on it in really significant ways. Marshall Field said that goodwill is the one and only asset that competition cannot undersell or destroy. If we want to have a collegial environment on our campus, it is not something that can be entrusted only to the faculty. It requires the active participation of all members of the community. Promotion of goodwill and collegiality is something we tend not to think about nearly enough. There are few things, however, that could better serve institutions than to make sure that students and all visitors to the campus are greeted warmly and treated decently. That is the kind of attitude and the kind of behavior that generates pride in the institution. Without pride, an institution cannot be healthy and vital.

What I have tried to suggest to you is that our facilities and their maintenance, preservation, and appearance are not just important, but indeed are critical to fulfilling the institution's mission. Your leadership is required and needed now, more than ever before. Your leadership can be most effectively utilized and benefited from

when there is an excellent working professional and, indeed, personal relationship between you and the business vice president and the president. Where this exists, your work will not only be important, it will also be fun.

The competition for resources and the pressures to allocate them in varying ways will not go away. But a business exercise may provide instruction on how we should proceed. Ask someone to draw an imaginary line on the floor and place people on both sides of the line. The purpose is to have one person convince the other to cross the line. I am told by people who have done this, that in the United States people seldom succeed in getting the other person to cross the line. But our Japanese counterparts simply say, "If you will cross the line, so will I." They exchange places and they both win. I know that times are difficult, but if we can see ourselves engaged in an enterprise collectively and cooperatively, we can survive these difficulties and do exceedingly good things for higher education.

I have been taught and instructed by people on our campus far more than I could have imagined a year ago. I hope that I have been a good student and a good learner. I leave you with this: A few weeks ago I saw a television program about gorillas. The moderator said in the postscript that we will conserve only what we love, we will love only what we understand, and we will understand only what we are taught. Teach us.

A Call to Servant Leadership

by Kent M. Keith

Leaders, managers, and administrators face a lot of interesting challenges at work each day. What they do and how well they do it is of fundamental importance to the institution. Leadership has a wide-ranging impact on thousands and thousands of people on campus.

How one leads is influenced by the ideas about leadership that each of us carries inside. For most people, ideas about leadership are ideas about power. I believe that we need a different focus. We need to focus on service, not power. And the leaders we need are *servant* leaders.

My purpose here is twofold: first, to explain what servant leadership is, and second, to call you to a life of servant leadership.

The Meaning of Life

To explain what servant leadership is and why it is important, I start with a simple and important question: What is the meaning of life? For many, the answer begins with religious faith. For most, the answer either begins or continues with love. I believe that in most countries, cultures, and centuries, people have discovered

that love is the meaning of life. Not power, wealth, sex, or fame, but love. Happy people are people who know how to give and receive love. For most people, that is the deepest, most exhilarating meaning of life.

The interesting thing about loving people, and wanting to help them, is that this love can grow until it encompasses all of humankind. You begin to feel compassion for all human beings. You begin to identify with their trials and tribulations, and you want to help them if you can. But how do you help?

The Servant Leader Defined

Servant leadership is a way to help. A servant leader is a leader who is focused on serving others. A servant leader is aware that he or she is an instrument for good, a person who has been given certain abilities or gifts which are meant to be used in helping others. Servant leaders are not worried about the attention others pay to them, but the attention they pay to others. A servant leader loves people, and wants to help them.

Servant leadership is not about power, it is about *service*. The servant leader does not go around asking, "How can I get power, how can I make people do things?" The servant leader asks, "What do people need? How can I help them get it? What does my organization need to do? How can I help my organization to do it?" Thus, rather than embarking on a quest for personal power, the servant leader embarks on a quest to identify and meet the needs of others.

Servant leaders do many of the same things that other leaders do. They envision goals, affirm values, plan, organize, motivate others, and so forth. The way servant leaders do these things depends on their personalities and the specific circumstances. The servant leader often surveys a group to look for what it needs to be effective and reach its goals. Because the missing link will vary, the servant leader does not always perform the same role or service in each situation.

A servant leader can accumulate and exercise power. A servant leader can become angry and enter the fray to do battle, mobilizing support and taking bold action. What is important is that the servant leader accumulates power or becomes angry *on behalf of others*. The servant leader acts in response to the way *others* are treated, not in response to the way he or she is treated.

There are times when a servant leader has to argue, engage in conflict, or get into a fight. But more often, a servant leader will stop a fight, by deflecting an attack, or by absorbing an attack and going on to do what really needs to be done. People who have the strength to do this can limit the amount of conflict and pain suffered by the organizations for which they work and the societies in which they live.

Whatever the situation, the servant leader is servant first. In his book, *Servant Leadership*, Robert Greenleaf makes it clear that someone who is a leader first may want to satisfy a drive for power or for the possession of material goods. Greenleaf says that a servant leader makes sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test of whether that is happening is to ask: "Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?"

Servant leadership is not a new idea. The concept can be found in many religions and philosophies. The *Gospel of Matthew* tells us that Christ came to serve, not to be served. He healed the sick, fed the hungry, and comforted those who were alone, or outcast. And he made it clear that his followers are to do the same. The *Tao Teh Ching* consists of the ancient writings of Lao-Tzu, a sage who lived in China about 500 B. C. Lao-Tzu is known as the founder of Taoism, a Chinese philosophy or religion which emphasizes simplicity, selflessness, and nonintervention. Lao-Tzu describes a leader who is so effective that he is nearly invisible. When the deeds are done, the people say, "We did it ourselves."

Examples of Servant Leaders

There are no doubt thousands of examples of servant leaders in literature, the movies, history, and daily life today. I think of historical figures such as Washington, Lincoln, Father Damien, Clara Barton, Eichi Shibusawa, Gandhi, Albert Schweitzer, Martin Luther King, and Mother Teresa.

While all of these people are famous, my guess is that most servant leaders have *not* been known outside the group or community they have served. Like Lao-Tzu's servant leader, they have been "invisible."

An especially good example of servant leadership is found in the book *Watership Down* by Richard Adams. This is a wonderful fable about a group of rabbits who set out to find a new home. Hazel-rah, who becomes the Chief Rabbit, is not the biggest rabbit in the group, nor the cleverest, nor the most clairvoyant. But he becomes the leader for a number of reasons. First, he is willing to listen, often asking for advice from others. Second, he knows the different strengths of the other rabbits, and draws out those strengths for the good of the group. Third, he is able to identify the needs of the group, and make decisions and take action in a way which unites the rabbits in seeking to achieve their common goals. And fourth, he is willing to pitch in, and take personal risks on behalf of the group. Hazel-rah is a servant leader in a participatory or democratic community. The rabbits face hard times, and are severely tested, but they work together as a team, and they find and build their new home.

I am impressed with the accomplishments of historical figures like Florence Nightingale, an English woman who lived from 1820 to 1910. Born into a wealthy family, her parents were horrified at her interest in nursing, because the image of nurses in those days was that most of them were either immoral or drunk or both. But Florence pursued her interest, gaining experience in Germany and assuming the management of a small hospital in London in 1853. When the Crimean War broke out the next year, she was asked by

the British government to take a group of nurses to Russian Crimea. She arrived with thirty-eight nurses, and found 5,000 wounded and sick men in bare buildings with no facilities. Often working twenty hours a day, she got the hospitals equipped and made them sanitary, dramatically improving the treatment of the soldiers. After the war she published a huge book on army hospitals, and then opened a training school for nurses. Florence Nightingale saved thousands of lives, and is often considered the founder of modern nursing.

For the servant leader within an organization, the question is: How can I be of service? Or in Peter Drucker's words, "What can I contribute?" Drucker, in *The Effective Executive*, writes:

> *The effective executive focuses on contribution. He looks up from his work and outward toward goals. He asks: 'What can I contribute that will significantly affect the performance and the results of the institution I serve?'*

Drucker notes that focusing on contribution requires the executive to look toward the performance of the whole– what is good for the entire organization. He or she looks *outside* the organization, because that is where the results are– that is where the people are who need help or need the product being produced. The effective executive comes to think of his or her work in terms of the purpose of the organization and the needs of the customer, or client, or patient. Drucker, in his own way, has described the effective executive as a servant leader, focused on contribution and focused on others.

Different Focus, Different Motivation

The differences in human motivations are fascinating to observe. An excellent example is the movie *Chariots of Fire*, the story of the British track team at the 1924 Olympics. The movie contrasts the personalities and motivations of several of the runners. Harold Abrahams has a chip on his shoulder. He is an intense, driven man;

he runs to prove something to the world. When he loses a race against Eric Liddel, he is crushed, he is destroyed, he doesn't know what to do. Ironically enough, the same thing happens later when he *wins* at the Olympics. Having only one goal, he is completely disoriented when he reaches it. Now what does he do?

Lord Lindsey runs for fun. He has money and position, and no possible worry for the future. He runs because— well, old chap, one has to do something with one's time, doesn't one!

Then there is Eric Liddel, the Scotsman, who runs with a depth of joy and strength of courage that delights the crowds and astounds other runners. During a race before the Olympics, a competing runner shoves Eric to the side, causing him to fall. Eric shakes himself, and then gets up, to run the greatest race of his life. As he breaks through the tape, he collapses, heaving and contorted on the ground. "It's not the prettiest race I've ever seen," says Coach Musabeni, "but certainly the bravest." Eric explains his motivation to his sister, who is opposed to his running. "God made me fast," he says, "and when I run, I feel His pleasure." Eric runs not to prove something to the world, nor for mere fun, but to feel God's pleasure when he uses the special gift that God has given him. To win is to honor that gift.

It is Eric Liddell's motivation that matches most closely what current writers are saying about good leaders. Good leaders are not driven; they lead out of a desire for self-expression, a desire to use the gifts they have been given. And good leaders are not just opportunists; they have personal integrity. When the British officials at the Olympics try to pressure Eric Liddell to run on a Sunday during the Olympics, Eric refuses as a matter of principle, since the Sabbath is the Lord's day, and not a day for sport. Lindsey solves the problem by offering Eric his own slot in another race on another day. One of the British officials, the Duke of Sutherland, understands Eric and tells Lord Birkenhead afterwards that it is a good thing Eric refused to run on a Sunday. "He is a true man of principle," Sutherland says, "and a true athlete. His speed is a mere extension of his life, its force. We sought to sever his running from

his self." In Eric's case, and in the case of great leaders, one cannot sever what one *does* from what one *is*.

Servant leaders have a different focus, and a different motivation, than most other leaders. They are focused on others, not themselves. And they are motivated to make life better for others, not for themselves.

The attributes or character traits of servant leaders are likely to include compassion, understanding, and selflessness. Their lifework is likely to focus on meeting the fundamental needs of others, such as food, clothing, shelter, education, jobs, and basic human rights. Colleges and universities have a major impact on at least three of these fundamental areas– education, jobs, and basic human rights. So you and your colleagues on your campuses are doing the kind of work that servant leaders do.

The Nature of Humankind

To serve others well, servant leaders have to *understand* others. They have to learn as much as they can about their fellow human beings– their fundamental needs and their hopes and dreams.

Fortunately, the fundamentals are easy to identify. One useful list of fundamentals is Abraham Maslow's famous "hierarchy of motives" that describes various levels of needs. These are usually presented in the form of a pyramid. Basic needs at the bottom of the pyramid include physiological needs such as air, water, food, shelter, sleep, and sex. Then we move up to safety and security. Climbing farther up the pyramid, we find love and feelings of belongingness. Even higher, we find competence, self-esteem, and esteem by others. Then there are a series of growth needs such as meaningfulness, self-sufficiency, effortlessness, playfulness, richness, simplicity, order, justice, completion, perfection, individuality, aliveness, beauty, goodness, and truth. Finally, at the top of the pyramid, we reach self-actualization.

I believe that basic needs also include spiritual needs and the needs of the soul. In virtually all cultures, human beings have

pondered the Creator, the Divine, and those things larger than themselves that are part of the wonder and mystery of their lives. We human beings search for meaning; we search for ways to fulfill the longings of the soul.

The emphasis on different needs varies by individual and by culture. However, when it comes to human values, we are all more alike than we are different. In all countries, cultures, and centuries, there have been similar ethical codes and laws regarding the right relationship of one person to another.

This was demonstrated by C. S. Lewis in his book, *The Abolition of Man.* As a simple research project, he collected writings, laws, and customs in ancient and modern societies in different parts of the world. He found that all agree that it is wrong to murder or be cruel to other human beings; that it is right to love one's spouse; that it is right to give to the poor and to love and care for neighbors and strangers; that there are duties to parents, elders, and ancestors; that there are duties to children and posterity; and that there are laws of justice, good faith, truth, mercy, and magnanimity. C. S. Lewis quoted from Hindu, Roman, Norse, Babylonian, Egyptian, Jewish, Australian Aborigine, American Indian, Chinese, Greek, and Christian texts.

There is something about the nature of humankind that has led each culture to a very similar code of conduct. It seems to me that the codes of conduct are similar because the basic wants and needs of all human beings are similar. These include the need to love and be loved, to belong, to participate in community, to have a sense of self-worth, to have the opportunity to learn and grow intellectually and spiritually, and to find meaning, dignity, and peace.

This is of great importance. The similarity of basic human needs means that servant leaders *can* understand the people they seek to serve. And that means that they *can* serve them well.

I began by saying that love is the meaning of life. It is also essential to physical growth and survival. Maslow once wrote that love is as essential to the growth of a human being as vitamins,

minerals, and protein. This was sadly indicated many years ago in a study in which observations were made of babies in orphanages. The babies were given food, water, clean clothes, and bedding. It was discovered, however, that if they were not touched or held, they died. They actually *died* for lack of physical contact, the simple everyday hugging and holding which are natural in every family.

This has special meaning for me. In April 1991, my wife and I returned to Honolulu from Romania with two babies, a 14-month-old baby boy and a 8-month-old baby girl. The baby girl, Angela, had not been fed much during her first four months, when her birth family abandoned her at a hospital in Bucharest. She had whooping cough, she had pus coming out of her ears, she had open sores on her back. The nurses told us she was going to die before we could adopt her. When we first held her, she didn't move. She was just hanging on. Our baby boy, Spencer, had been abandoned at birth. He was being fed a kind of rice gruel, but he had been kept in a crib, with nothing to play with, and he didn't know how to stand up, much less crawl or walk.

According to diagnostic tests conducted after their first year with us, they had both caught up to the "normal" range in their development in all areas– except speech, because nobody in Romania had talked to them, and they didn't know what speech was.

Today, Angela and Spencer are 5 and 5-½ years old, both happy and healthy. It is true that they needed food and medicine, but mostly, they needed what any human being could have given them: love and attention. When they began to receive that love and attention, they blossomed in an astonishing way. We feel very blessed to have them, and to be growing and learning while helping them to grow and learn.

I have said that love for others is the basis for servant leadership. It is also important to remember that when we give our love to others, it can change their lives in a wonderful way. When we see

that change, and are touched by it, then our gift comes back to us, inspiring us and sustaining us as we continue to serve.

Relevance and Meaning

Servant leadership is the best kind of leadership for both the leader and the led. All other types of leadership become irrelevant to the needs of those being led, or result in the corruption of the leader himself.

The leader who is not focused on others will be focused on himself or herself. But the desires or needs of the leader may be in no way connected to the desires or needs of the rest of the organization or the rest of society. That is why it is easy for that kind of leader to become irrelevant.

Also, leadership that is not servant leadership easily results in the personal corruption or unhappiness of the leader. The leader who seeks power for himself or herself can never get enough. *Never.* Power becomes a disease, a drug, a fanatic drive, an addiction. After a while, it no longer matters what the power is for– the leader simply craves more and more of it. As the addiction grows stronger, the leader loses his or her values and becomes spiritually corrupt. And since the leader can never get enough power, he or she is never happy. The victories mean too little; the defeats mean too much. The leader lives a life of frustration, restlessness, dissatisfaction, rage, and even self-torment.

Unfortunately, in the never-ending drive for power, the leader's ego becomes over-enlarged, and false pride, pettiness, crassness, spite, and a desire for conflict set in and take hold. The leader thus becomes an *obstacle* to the achievement of society's hopes and dreams. The over-enlarged egos of leaders have prevented an immense amount of good from being achieved in our world.

Servant leaders achieve an immense amount of good because they are relevant– they focus on the needs of others. Servant leaders also succeed because of their spiritual resources. Servant

leadership provides the leader with something that power and its trappings cannot provide: personal meaning and inner peace.

A person who embarks on a quest for power will never be satisfied. A person who embarks on a quest to serve others will always find meaning, and will always be at peace with himself. He or she will have a reservoir of spiritual strength to draw upon. This is a secret of servant leadership— it provides the inner resources which make it possible for the servant leader to go on, to continue striving and serving others, no matter how difficult it may be.

The Three Options and the Paradoxical Commandments

When you love people, and you see that they have many needs, you only have three basic options:

1. Do nothing, and ignore the needs of others— an option which is a moral failure; or
2. Take advantage of people's weaknesses, cynically exploit their needs, and seek personal gain at their expense— an option which is an even *worse* moral failure; or
3. Do the right thing— try to meet people's needs.

The third option is the servant leader option, and it is the only moral one. That is still the right option, even if you fail to achieve what you hope to achieve.

This is important: A person who tries to do what is right and good and true, and feels that he or she has failed, may be tempted to shift to the cynical, immoral option of exploiting others, or the indifferent option of doing nothing. But the servant leader option is the only truly moral option, even if things are not going the way you had hoped, or people don't appreciate what you have done, or people even attack you for the good you are trying to do.

The issue of appreciation is a big one for those who serve, especially those who serve behind the scenes. A lot of good people are always being taken for granted, never being thanked. In facilities management, people expect you to keep everything

operating perfectly– 100 percent perfect all the time. Since they view perfection as the norm, you get no credit for being perfect. However, if anything is *less* than perfect, you're going to hear about it. So, in their eyes, you can only fail.

In an environment like that, where people take your good work for granted and only give you input when they are unhappy, you have to have your own reasons for getting up and going to work in the morning. You also have to resist the lowering of standards. I have heard this many times, and so have you: "The people we serve don't appreciate us, so why should we give them our best?" The answer is that you have your own professional standards, and you derive a sense of meaning and satisfaction from doing a good job– no, a *great* job. It doesn't matter whether anybody knows it or appreciates it; you still have to do what's right. This is about *you*, not *them*, and *you* are a professional with high standards.

Each of us likes to be appreciated; I think that's normal. But it is hard to be a servant leader if applause is what you crave. Focusing on the applause means that you are focused on yourself, not others. Also, people who crave applause are like people who crave power– they can never get enough. No matter how much recognition they get, they are convinced that they are still being slighted.

Unfortunately, it is not just a matter of whether you get applause. Servant leaders are just as likely to be attacked, as they are to be praised.

I figured this out pretty early in life. By the time I was 20, I had discovered that you had to do what was right and good and true *because* it was right and good and true, not because anybody would appreciate it. Doing what was right and good and true gave me meaning and satisfaction that nobody could take away– and, for that matter, which nobody could *add* very much to, either. The meaning and satisfaction were mine, and they were sufficient unto themselves.

So at the age of 20, I sat down and wrote what now looks to me like a simple credo for servant leaders. It was 1968, at the height

of the unrest on U.S. college campuses, and I was writing a booklet for high school student leaders about how to work through the system to get things done. I challenged them with what I called "The Paradoxical Commandments of Leadership." Here they are:

1. People are illogical, unreasonable, and self-centered. Love them anyway.
2. If you do good, people will accuse you of selfish, ulterior motives. Do good anyway.
3. If you are successful, you win false friends and true enemies. Succeed anyway.
4. The good you do today will be forgotten tomorrow. Do good anyway.
5. Honesty and frankness make you vulnerable. Be honest and frank anyway.
6. The biggest men and women with the biggest ideas can be shot down by the smallest men and women with the smallest minds. Think big anyway.
7. People favor underdogs but follow only top dogs. Fight for a few underdogs anyway.
8. What you spend years building may be destroyed overnight. Build anyway.
9. People really need help but may attack you if you do help them. Help people anyway.
10. Give the world the best you have and you'll get kicked in the teeth. Give the world the best you have anyway.

Servant leaders understand and accept paradoxical commandments like these. Servant leaders do what is right and good and true, whether they get no applause, indifference, or even a negative response. They appreciate recognition, but they are not in it for the applause. They like to be treated well, but they are not especially surprised or discouraged when they are treated badly.

When it comes to achievement, servant leaders often see "success" in different terms than the rest of the world. A concept that means a lot to me in this regard is found in the Bible at John 17: 14-15. The idea in this passage is that Jesus and his disciples are *in* the world without being *of* the world. The scene is the Last Supper, and Jesus is praying for his disciples. He says in his prayer:

> *I have given them your word and the world has hated them, for they are not of the world any more than I am of the world. My prayer is not that you take them out of the world but that you protect them from the evil one.*

We are *in* the world, and we should engage it fully, loving others, serving others, feeling joy and sorrow, working hard, growing in wisdom, growing toward perfection. But even as we are fully engaged in the world, we do not have to be *of* the world– we do not have to base our actions on the world's values, nor judge ourselves by the world's definitions of success. We can live by deeper values, and reaffirm more fundamental truths.

The secret is to set high goals, and yet find joy in even the smallest improvement or advance. Servant leaders do not expect instant, total success. They keep their eyes on the goal, and they keep working.

This is dramatized in Jean Giono's story, "The Man Who Planted Hope and Grew Happiness." The man lived in Southeastern France at the turn of the century. He lived alone in a barren area which had once been a forest with its own villages. He went out each day and planted trees. Year after year, decade after decade, seed by seed, he kept planting. The trees began to grow into a forest, which held water in the soil, so that other plants could grow, and birds could make nests, and streams could flow again, and people could return and build homes and raise families. By the end of his lifetime, he had totally transformed and restored the natural environment of an entire region. This is a good metaphor for the work of a servant leader, who works each day, planting hope and growing happiness for others. The work may seem

simple and modest, and yet be powerful and long-lasting in its impact.

Those same words could be said to every parent, or guardian, or foster parent, about what they do to help their children: The work may seem simple and modest, and yet be powerful and long-lasting in its impact.

Servant leaders may accumulate power, prestige, fame, and fortune, and be a great success in the world's terms– or they may not. It is possible to be both a worldly success and a servant leader at the same time. But servant leaders know that the challenge is to not set worldly goals as the final goals, because if they do, those worldly goals may take their eyes off the people whom they wish to serve. And success, for the servant leader, is ultimately defined in terms of those they serve.

Deciding What to Do

How do servant leaders decide what to do? Certainly, some of the things that servant leaders do, they do as a result of their analysis of world or national problems. War, starvation, disease, and environmental degradation are big problems. Crime, unemployment, racial discrimination, health care, substance abuse, and education are big problems.

In addition to world and national problems, servant leaders often deal with issues or events that are right in front of them, directly affecting them or their families, friends, and neighbors. They often work on problems that they just happen to come across, as in the story of the Good Samaritan. The Good Samaritan saw a man who was injured, at the side of the road, beaten by robbers. He went to him, bandaged his wounds, took him to an inn, and took care of him.

Apparently, the Samaritan did not debate with himself as to whether there might be somebody with a greater need further down the road, or on another road, or in another city, or in a different season. He apparently did not argue with himself as to

whether he was the right man to help, or whether he had the time to help, or could afford to help, or whether somebody else should come to help instead. He didn't say this is a rural problem, outside his urban jurisdiction. He saw a need, and he acted.

Servant Leadership on Campus

Who we are as individual leaders— how we see leadership, what motivates us, our sense of meaning, and how we decide what to do, is philosophical and personal. It may not seem very practical, but, in fact, I can't think of anything *more* practical. People who work with you, or for you, or for whom you work, will judge your character pretty quickly. They know almost instantly whether you are in it for power, or for service; whether you are focused on yourself, or on others. They know if you are willing to listen, or only to speak; whether you want to help *them* succeed, or see them only as pawns to be manipulated for your own success. They may perceive you correctly or incorrectly, but these perceptions color all of your relationships. These perceptions either enhance or limit what you are able to accomplish as a leader.

If you are a servant leader, you will find that your relationships are enhanced and your ability to facilitate accomplishments is expanded. When it is clear that your focus is on the needs of your institution, those who work there, and those you all serve, then more people will listen to you, and more people will trust you. A few, of course, will be suspicious or confused, and wonder what you are *really* up to. However, most will understand, and will be truly grateful.

Being a servant leader is especially important during hard times. We all know that higher education is going through a difficult, and important, period of cutting and shaping. You have already made many hard decisions, and you will be making many more. The changes you need to make will not be effective unless people understand them, and however reluctantly, accept them. Few will follow you into the new paradigms unless they trust you, and

believe that you are acting for the good of the institution rather than for your own power or position.

To make a change stick, you have to bring most of the people with you. Unless others understand and support it, it won't happen. People will move forward if they have been part of a process which helped them to understand where they need to go and why, and includes some of their own ideas about how to get there. People will move forward with a servant leader.

All this is true of any organization undergoing change. However, it seems to me that servant leadership is especially appropriate as the leadership model for colleges and universities. Colleges and universities need strong leadership and clearly assigned responsibilities at all levels of the organization. However, colleges and universities also need to share governance and operate in a collegial fashion, with consultation, participation, and information-sharing throughout the campus community. The challenge is to achieve *both* strong leadership *and* collegial, campuswide participation.

The power model of leadership is *not* well suited to collegiality and participation, since it focuses on obtaining and using power to make people do things. The power model presupposes and even promotes conflict. Leaders using the power model tend to be more autocratic.

The service model, by contrast, focuses on identifying and meeting the needs of others. The service model presupposes and promotes collegiality, with consultation, participation, and information-sharing as part of the daily life of the organization. The service model is also open to everyone, regardless of where they are in the power structure. Each faculty or staff member, each administrator or trustee, can identify and help meet the needs of others. Each faculty or staff member, each administrator or trustee, can be a servant leader.

Many colleges and universities are working hard on customer service or student-centered service. It seems to me that the concept of servant leadership provides us with an important

philosophical foundation for the service model. If we love people, and care about them, we want the best for them. We want to identify their needs, and seek to meet those needs. In our daily lives on our campuses, we want to pay attention to our students, and strive to serve them well. We also want to pay attention to *each others'* needs, as colleagues, and respond to those needs, so that all of us, as a team, can serve our students well.

Conclusion

Let me conclude by affirming that the world needs many, many more servant leaders, facilitating, healing, focusing on the needs of others. No other leadership role requires as much wisdom, compassion, strength, and skill as servant leadership. And no other leadership role is as exciting, meaningful, and satisfying as servant leadership. It is a role that will draw upon all that you are, and stimulate you to grow and become all that you can be. It is a role that is badly needed in each family, each college or university, each community, each nation.

How Leaders Create Change

by Charles W. Jenkins

"Someone suggested that I write about how leaders create change." It seemed like a good idea, so I began to research the literature to see what others had already said on the topic. "Leaders have a vision," said the literature, "which they then convince the followers is worthwhile so that everyone shares the vision, then they all march off arm-in-arm in pursuit of the shared vision and everyone lives happily ever after and that's how change occurs." Well, I thought that read okay, but I really couldn't relate it to my everyday environment. Nor could I develop a meaningful talk or written commentary from it. So, I kept on researching.

Eventually, I re-read something I had read years ago in Michael LeBoeuf's *How to Win Customers and Keep Them for Life*. Chapter 20 is only five pages long. In it, LeBoeuf shares what he calls the greatest management principle in the world, which is "The things that get rewarded get done." He tells the following story to illustrate his point:

A man went fishing one day. He looked over the side of his boat and saw a snake with a frog in its mouth. Feeling sorry for the frog, he reached down, gently took the frog from the snake, and set the frog free. But then he felt sorry for the snake. He looked around the boat, but he had no food. All he had was a bottle of bourbon. So he opened the bottle and gave the snake a few shots. The snake went off happy, the frog was happy, and the man was happy to have performed such good deeds. He thought everything was great until about ten minutes later when he heard something knock against the side of the boat. With stunned disbelief, the fisherman looked down and saw the snake was back– with two frogs.

The blinding flash that I got from Chapter 20 was this: Leaders create change by changing the reward system. If you want different behavior, stop rewarding the kind you don't want and start rewarding the kind you do.

I thought of a training video we had made for use in our department. The video depicts eight different situations in which physical plant service providers come face-to-face with service receivers, or customers. In each case, the actor first shows the wrong way to behave in the situation, then, after some narration, the correct way. Each vignette was suggested by one of our superintendents, scripted by them, and acted by department employees. The situations come from actual on-the-job experiences. It is very powerful.

Why did I think of the video? Because the truth hit me like a thunderbolt that, in both cases, the right way and the wrong, the actor was simply portraying a person who was responding to the reward system set by management. In one vignette an HVAC repairman named Steve is responding to a service call. During the first encounter with the requester he is gruff and uncommunicative. The customer is thoroughly disgusted with the entire experience. The narrator then explains how Steve could have been more solicitous of his customer, how he could have kept her apprised

of what he was doing and needed to do, how he could have kept her in the communication loop and feeling better about what was going on. Then, the scene is repeated with Steve doing all the suggested things. The customer is smiling when he leaves. The narrator then asks, "Wasn't the second time better?"

Sure it was, but in both cases Steve was simply behaving the way the reward system had taught him to. What? You mean you rewarded employees for being gruff and taciturn? No, but what we did reward, above all else, was production. "We're a lean, mean producing machine," was our credo. "We do more with less." In that environment, the worker who completed the most work orders, answered the most service calls, moved fastest and worked the quickest was the hero. He or she got the biggest raise, was named employee-of-the-whatever-period and was favored by the boss with smiles, conversation, opportunity, and perquisites. On the other hand, the worker who spent the time and effort to visit with the customer, to be friendly, informative, and helpful was considered a goof-off. Being lean, mean, and efficient left no time for schmoozing, so schmoozing couldn't be good. Gruff was rewarded; friendly wasn't. It was that simple.

So, why the change? Why a video to explain that gruff won't be rewarded any longer and friendly will? Because our customers insisted on it. Our customer service evaluations came back with very direct comments about the behavior of some of our service providers. The comments concerned the ones who were the most productive and so, we thought, were our best employees. By our internal standard they were, but our customers had a different standard.

We remembered what Tom Peters wrote ten years ago in *A Passion for Excellence* when he paraphrased Arch McGill as follows, "The individual customer perceives service in his or her own unique, idiosyncratic, human, emotional, end-of-the-day, irrational, erratic terms." We decided that we had not been, as Peters suggests we should, listening naively to our customers. We had,

instead, considered our superior technical knowledge of our service more important than their perceptions.

We could probably have survived by continuing to be gruff but efficient. After all, we have a captive market. But, why have customers who don't like us? Aren't we, after all, here to make life at the university more pleasant for everyone? We decided to change our image.

The training video was a part of the image overhaul. LeBoeuf goes on to say that:

> *There are three basic ways for a manager to teach employees how to treat customers:*
> - *Tell them what you want;*
> - *Show them what you want;*
> - *Measure and reward what you want.*

We shared the service evaluation comments with the entire staff and discussed customer expectations and perceptions as a way of telling them what we wanted. We made the video and modeled correct behavior ourselves to show them what we wanted. We now make it a point to reward employees who receive favorable comments from customers for their friendliness and cooperation. We've been doing it for almost four years. It's paying off. We're no longer gruff, but friendly.

Are we as lean, mean, and efficient as we were before? Probably not, but we still get the job done well within our allotted resources. Our customers like us a lot better, too, and said as much in subsequent evaluation surveys. But, the bottom line is that we, the managers and leaders, had to decide what kind of behavior we expected and then change the system to reward that kind.

What kind of behavior does your system reward? Is it the kind you want? To quote LeBoeuf once again,

> *You would think that such a simple, obvious principle would be recognized in most organizations. Guess again! The single greatest obstacle to effective performance in most organizations is the giant mismatch between the behavior needed and the behavior rewarded. Organizations of all kinds fall into the trap of hoping for A, rewarding B, and wondering why they get B.*

What do you want? What are you getting? Check what you, as a leader and manager, are rewarding.

Well, I thought I had a scoop with my blinding flash from Chapter 20. "Wow!" I said, "A paradigm shift." I rushed home that evening to share my scoop with my unpaid management and human relations consultant, wife Ann. She said, "Guess again, Sherlock. All you've done is change the reward system to make Steve behave in the new way management wants him to. If you want a new paradigm, let Steve say what kind of behavior will be rewarded." That set me back for awhile, and reminded me that I'm not nearly as smart about paradigms as I thought.

Stephen Covey, in *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, said that "If you want incremental change, work on altering your behavior. If you want quantum change, alter your paradigm."

But, how can I alter the paradigm so that HVAC technicians dictate how HVAC technicians should behave? How can I possibly get them all to agree on a standard? Where will we find the time to figure all this out? It's too difficult. Forget it.

Then, I had another blinding flash. Don't worry about a group-devised standard. Let each HVAC technician establish his or her own individual standard for what behavior is to be rewarded. Use the fourth habit of highly effective people. Reach, with each individual, a win-win performance agreement.

Now, people who have read *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* and graduates of APPA's Foundations of Leadership for Facilities Officers will know immediately what I mean.

Let me briefly fill in the rest of you. In presenting the fourth habit, which he calls "Think Win-Win," Covey postulates that there are six paradigms of interpersonal action. They are win-win, win-lose, lose-win, lose-lose, win, and win-win or no deal. He goes on to explain each, but concludes that win-win is "the only real alternative in interdependent realities." He describes win-win as follows: "Win-win is a frame of mind and heart that constantly seeks mutual benefit in all human interactions. Win-win means that agreements or solutions are mutually beneficial, mutually satisfying. With a win-win solution, all parties feel good about the decision and feel committed to the action plan. Win-win sees life as a cooperative, not a competitive arena."

So, to pursue our new paradigm, Steve and I sit down to develop a win-win performance agreement for his next reporting period. I've told him ahead of time about this revolutionary thing we're going to try. He's to come to the meeting prepared to state in clear terms what results will make him consider his experience over the period a win. I will do the same. We know from Covey's *Seven Habits* that a win-win agreement explicitly defines:

- Desired results (not methods): identify what is to be done and when.
- Guidelines: specify the parameters (principles, policies, etc.) within which results are to be accomplished.
- Resources: identify the human, financial, technical or organizational support available to help accomplish the results.
- Accountability: set up the standards of performance and the time of evaluation.
- Consequences: good and bad, natural and logical– what does and will happen as a result of the evaluation.

I ask Steve what will make the next period a win for him. He says, "Boss, little league baseball is beginning. I'd sure like to get off at 3 p.m. so I can help coach my son's team."

"That's it?" I ask.

"Yes sir," says Steve, "that would really be a win, and I'd go back on regular hours as soon as baseball's over."

"Okay, Steve," I say, "a win for me is for you to be happy, to be at least as productive as you are on your regular shift and to be friendly to our customers, not gruff."

"That's it?" says Steve.

"That's it," I reply.

Steve says, "Let's deal."

So we reach an agreement. For the next performance period Steve will report for work at 6 a.m., take a half-hour for lunch, and get off at 2:30 p.m. We write into the agreement:

Desired results: Steve will work a schedule which permits him to coach baseball. He will complete the same quantity of work, of the same quality, as during the previous reporting period.

Guidelines: Steve will observe all departmental safety and security practices, standard work methods, etc., just as he would if working under supervision during regular hours.

Resources: I will assure that Steve has tasks assigned which he can complete during the early morning. He will be issued any necessary keys to enable him to enter places which are closed before regular hours. He will have access to the tools and supplies he normally does.

Accountability: Once each month and at the end of the performance period Steve and I will jointly review his performance against the desired result.

Consequences: If Steve isn't meeting the desired result because of some reason beyond his control but within mine, we'll remedy the problem and continue. If it's because of something Steve could himself remedy, we'll discuss it once and continue. If the deficiency remains at the next review, we'll terminate the agreement immediately.

"These five elements," says Covey, "give win-win agreements a life of their own. A clear understanding and agreement up front in these areas creates a standard against which people can measure their own success."

But what if Steve and I hadn't come to terms so easily on what was, for each of us, a win? What if his win, or mine, was totally unacceptable to the other? Then we fall back, as Covey suggests, to "win-win or no deal."

Win-win or no deal is a paradigm for those who are first venturing into the win-win environment. With this paradigm, we approach an agreement with the understanding that, if we can't both feel like winners, we'll simply "agree to disagree agreeably" and abandon the effort. We'll proceed as we have been and try for win-win again sometime when the climate is better.

And for win-win to work, the climate must be right. Covey points out that win-win agreements can only evolve from win-win relationships and win-win relationships can only thrive in a win-win atmosphere. There are many facets to such an atmosphere. Most of them, unfortunately, are totally alien to what we recognize as the standard workplace.The one factor which overrides all others is trust. In a win-win atmosphere, or relationship, there must be consummate trust. Even before he came to the meeting, Steve had to trust that I wasn't just trotting out another gimmick to try to manipulate him. Then, before he could become so vulnerable as to share with me his desire to coach his son's baseball team, he had to trust me not to scoff at such an idea. I had to trust that Steve wouldn't choose some totally impractical condition as a win for him. There had to be, quite simply, a high degree of mutual trust in the relationship between us. And, generally speaking, in our

pursuit of such high-trust relationships we're starting from a long way back.

Because, for most of us, our paradigm is rooted in the traditional authoritarian supervision model where the boss gives the order and the rest obey without question. This model, according to Covey (and common sense) is a win-lose paradigm. What makes it hard for us to give up that paradigm is our fear of losing control. In *The Fifth Discipline* by Peter Senge, Robert Swigett, retired CEO of the Kollmorgen Corporation, is quoted as follows: "In moving from the traditional authoritarian, hierarchical organization to a locally controlled organization, the single greatest issue is control. Beyond money, beyond fame, what drives most executives of traditional organizations is power, the desire to be in control. Most would rather give up anything than control" (Senge, 1990).

But, if we can make the shift to win-win, if we can trust enough to give up some of our control, then we can truly feel, as Covey does, that "It is much more ennobling to the human spirit to let people judge themselves than to judge them. And in a high trust culture, it's much more accurate. In many cases people know in their hearts how things are going much better than the records show. Discernment is often far more accurate than either observation or measurement."

So, I encourage you to examine your current paradigm. If it isn't win-win (and if it is you're truly an exceptional individual) think about starting to build such an atmosphere, to the extent that you are able. If you don't think you or the time is quite right for win-win, then at least make sure that you're rewarding the kind of behavior you want.

Don't be discouraged if you have setbacks and misfires. We all have our Arnolds. Arnold is a fellow I learned about from Harvey Mackay of the Mackay Envelope Corporation. The boss called Arnold into the office to see if he had any explanation for his miserable job performance. "I've gone over your supervisors' reports, and I think you ought to be aware of some of the concerns they've expressed. For instance, on your first assignment on the

assembly line, the foreman wrote, 'Arnold does not seem to have a grasp of the need for arriving at work on time.' Then you went to the shipping department, and your supervisor there wrote, 'We have had a record number of returns this month, due to Arnold's habit of mislabeling our deliveries.' And here's one from your current department head in marketing, 'We had to recall all our point-of-purchase posters when we discovered that Arnold had misspelled the name of the company.'

Arnold's boss continued, "That's quite a record. Three separate jobs and three disasters. What I really ought to do is fire you. What do you have to say to that?" Arnold answered, "The same thing I said before, I'll try to do better next time, Dad" (Mackay 1993).

How do leaders create change in the workplace, in employee behavior? I could probably have shortstopped this whole dissertation at the beginning by simply quoting J.W. Marriott, Jr. of the Marriott Corporation. "Motivate them, train them, care about them, and make winners out of them.....we know that if we treat our employees correctly, they'll treat the customers right. And, if customers are treated right, they'll come back" (LeBoeuf 1987).

It isn't exactly rocket science, is it?

Sustaining Excellence: Bold Strategies for Transforming Your Organization

by William L. Maynard and Thomas J. Champoux

Excellence is not about having things, or about having recognition, or about having money or power or position. It's about being part of something worthwhile– where people can go above and beyond.

– Pat Riley

The pattern for the future has already been established. Those organizations that learn to excel and, more importantly, sustain their levels of excellence will succeed in the new global economy. Those that do not, will likely disappear.

After twenty years of working with culture change and helping organizations "do better," it is clear that the employees at all levels of your organization will be the key to your future success. Fully utilizing both the technical and people resources will require doing things very differently– so differently that the transformation process will require courage and boldness on the part of today's leaders and managers. First, we will provide a framework for what we

believe to be the current situation in most organizations, and then an outline of seven strategies we have found to be critical to the transformation of an organization.

In 1982, Tom Peters and Bob Waterman published their book *In Search Of Excellence*. It was an astounding best seller, resulting in a wave of interest in "excellence." Though few realized it at the time, the book triggered a major shift in how leaders and managers viewed their organizations. The country was entangled in a serious recession, our economy was in trouble, and so were many organizations.

The conclusions that Peters and Waterman arrived at were based on studies of forty-three companies, all of which had demonstrated superiority over their competitors for twenty years. Each had been an industry leader. Peters and Waterman used as their criteria for identifying the "excellent" companies the twenty-year averages of: (1) compound asset growth, (2) compound equity growth, (3) ratio of market value to book value, (4) return on capital, (5) return on equity, (6) return on sales.

Since the publication of their work a remarkable discovery has emerged. Within five years of the publication of the book, two-thirds of the companies were no longer on the list, and by 1990, only fourteen of the original forty-three companies were still considered "excellent." Peters and Waterman showed that achieving excellence is indeed difficult. And time has proven that sustaining excellence is nearly impossible.

What goes wrong?

The Paradox of Excellence

Excellence is not an accomplishment. It is a spirit, a never-ending process.

– Lawrence M. Miller

Excellence– To excel; to become the best at what you do.

It has become clear to us that most organizations are primarily driven by economic forces, technological forces, or both. These forces often result in short-term and quick-fix strategies, but rarely result in long-range, sustainable improvements. Typically, major changes in ways of doing things are pushed through in order to save money or generate more money. As an example, improvements in productivity are expected as a result of implementing Total Quality Management, quality circles, reengineering, downsizing, reorganizing, and other forms of technological change. These usually result in short-term changes in the financial indicators, but little change in the organization's ability to achieve or sustain a higher level of excellence over time.

Until very recently there has been little attention paid to the dynamics and interactions of people within organizations and the impact they have on bottom-line results. We believe that focusing only on economic and technological variables and issues can actually prevent organizations from achieving excellence and limit their success over the long run. Equal attention and the resources of time and energy must be paid to the development of people at all levels in order to truly transform an organization and sustain excellence.

Our view of excellence contains a paradox. True excellence is not achievable. Achieving and sustaining excellence is a process; the continuing process of becoming the best you can be— and then working at getting better. It requires generating a sense of urgency for change throughout the organization, and the wisdom to balance the financial forces with the needs and capabilities of the people. The difficulty is compounded by the nagging drive for quarterly earnings or short-term goals at the expense of long-term benefits (sustaining excellence). There needs to be a balance; dollars and people working together to become the best. Sustaining this level of excellence not only results in financial success, but also in the stability and growth of the organization.

Building a Better Workplace

We want satisfaction from accomplishment and friendships, balanced personal and professional lives, and to have fun in all our endeavors.

– Levi Strauss & Company

Organizations need to become healthy, fun, and good places for people to work. They need to be places that are not only exceptionally productive in terms of output and financial return, but must also be places of decency and dignity, where people treat each other with respect and kindness.

When we ask hourly employees, or supervisors and managers about their workplace, 98 percent tell us they really want it to be a better place: more pleasant, more fun, with less stress and anxiety. They want to be treated with dignity and respect.

With few exceptions, a pleasant environment in which people treat each other well is a more productive place– and healthier. We have worked in places in which people treat each other kindly, and in places where people don't. Kind is better. We have also been in places where the primary mode of feedback is praise, and in those in which it is criticism. Praise is better. When people are treated poorly they become alienated and hostile. They put in their time and look for ways to get even. We are continuously amazed at the insensitivity and shortsightedness of many managers. Consider these as situations that are not so unusual in our business world today.

Recently a mid-size manufacturing company was faced with a difficult financial decision. They had spent many months building trust and teamwork internally, but sales had slipped for several quarters, and Wall Street downgraded their rating. The management team decided that an immediate downsizing was a short-term but necessary solution. They also agreed that they needed to keep the whole thing quiet for two reasons: they didn't want to alarm the employees, and they wanted to minimize the effect on the stock price. The final decision was made on a Wednesday, and

on the following Monday, without announcement, over 200 employees were handed "effective immediately" termination notices as they arrived at work. The layoff accomplished the short-term goal, but destroyed morale and trust. One unanticipated result was that a number of highly skilled, long-term employees who had survived the sudden termination, left the company to work at a "better place."

Here is how a manager who survived a major downsizing in another company described his experience.

> *Ours is a $1.2 billion organization which recently experienced a decline in profits and in stock price. A new president was brought in and a short time later ordered an across the board budget cut of 8 percent. We managers were told that if we made the cuts by April 1 (three months) we could charge them off on current expenses and not affect next year's budget. No criteria for budget reduction were provided, so almost all of the cuts were accomplished through elimination of employee positions. Some 900 people were quickly terminated. Many had been with the company for 10 to 25 years. Soon after the layoffs, upper management discovered that many critical positions had been eliminated, so they brought back nearly 200 people.*

"I know of one woman," he went on to say, "who had started with the company twenty-five years ago as an hourly employee, had continued her education, and eventually was promoted into a management position. When her position was terminated, several other managers stepped forward and wanted to keep her. The decision went to the vice president of finance who said that, because of her salary, he couldn't justify keeping her, and she was terminated."

"There was total destruction of the social systems, of teams and teamwork, and of loyalty, commitment, and the desire to do the job. But Wall Street loved it. They called it a demonstration of

commitment and control, and recommended a buy of the stock. I'm looking for a new job."

Contrast these examples with the Harman Management Company. They are fun people to be around. Pete Harman was the original co-founder, with Colonel Sanders, of Kentucky Fried Chicken. Pete, at age 75, is still the active CEO of the company, and his executive vice chairman is Jackie Trujillo. Harman Management owns 265 KFC stores located in California, Colorado, Utah, and Washington. Pete and Jackie know each of the store managers and assistant managers personally. Managers are provided opportunities for ownership in their stores, and actively engage all of their employees in the success of each store. Teamwork and playing fair are qualities emphasized throughout the entire organization. Pete and Jackie not only model these values, but also share the company's success; they have provided a profit sharing plan that includes hourly employees. At Harman's, people work hard and play hard. Every year the company provides a week long conference for managers, assistant managers, and spouses. Half go to a resort in Southern California and the other half to Hawaii, then the following year they switch. All expenses are paid. A big part of their week is focused on relationships and play.

Pete, Jackie, and the Harman management team have created an extraordinary culture in an industry noted for burnout and high turnover. Their results are equally extraordinary. The industry average annual employee turnover is 250 percent. At Harman's it is only 100 percent. The average industry turnover of store managers is near 100 percent, compared to Harman's 14 percent. On top of all this, Harman's is a very financially successful company; sales have continued to increase even in a declining market, they continue to reduce costs and increase efficiency, and they have been consistently profitable.

Transformation Requires Courage

Why not go out on a limb? That's where the fruit is.
– Will Rogers

In our work with clients, we have found that most executives, managers, and team leaders are hearing the message "we must change." Few, however, know what to change or have acquired the knowledge and skills necessary for successful large scale change. The reaction to change ranges from denial, sabotage, and frustration, to autocratic demands for democratic participation.

Why is it so difficult for executives and managers to develop and utilize healthy and effective strategies for change? We think there are several significant, yet resolvable difficulties. First, most managers don't know how to implement effective strategies. Their predecessors didn't do it. Their mentors didn't do it. These skills weren't taught in MBA programs, so they have had no model to learn from. Second, they are rewarded and promoted for their technical expertise, their financial management ability, and for accomplishing tasks, not for dealing effectively with their people. Third, it costs money and takes time to cultivate sustainable organizational change, and initially these dollars have a negative effect on the bottom line. These factors present powerful forces which create a situation difficult to change.

Bold Strategies for Transforming Your Organization

Our strategies for transformation are bold, but vital for the success of organizations. In addition, many are contrary to traditional management structures and most corporate cultures. Bold because they are perceived as "soft and fuzzy" by the bottom-line managers, and a "fad of the month" by others. Bold because they require total commitment by management and an investment of time and money– and they fly in the face of the drive for profits every ninety days that Wall Street demands. It takes boldness to change an organization from old ways of doing things, and it takes

courage to stand up to the criticism, cynicism, and ridicule of those who refuse to believe differently, and who desperately hold on to the past.

It takes courage to act differently, but for those who do, the changes can be everlasting. In brief, the strategies we have found to be most effective for achieving and sustaining excellence are:

- *Strategy One*– Create a climate of caring. Theodore Leavitt, as editor of the *Harvard Business Review*, wrote, "A business can never have too many customers, too many capital assets, or too much decency." Leavitt's comment about decency goes to the heart of the most important key of all for transformation. A caring organization is healthy, innovative, fun, and profitable.
- *Strategy Two*– Develop cooperation at all levels. A cooperative organization is one in which all employees work with each other, share knowledge and skills, and are mutually responsible for the success of the organization. The prevailing attitude is, "we're in this together, and we need each other in order to win." Teamwork at all levels is promoted, and destructive internal rivalries are eliminated.
- *Strategy Three*– Focus on quality. In recent years there has been great emphasis on quality improvement. Most efforts are focused on the quality of products or quality of service within the organization. Our experience tells us that quality improvement needs to be a continuous process, focusing on the quality of people's behavior and the quality of relationships within the organization as well.
- *Strategy Four*– Adaptability: the ability to turn on a dime. The ability to turn on a dime is the real statement of adaptability. It has to do with developing an internal climate of innovation and rapid response: anticipation and action. This is a major shift for most organizations and requires breaking out of old "comfort zones."
- *Strategy Five*– Continuously develop skills. People will be required to work in ways that are different than what they have done in the past. Real teamwork, for example, requires skills that are different from simply being a member

of a work group. Skill development means an ongoing investment in training– but not just any training. Our studies show that 85 to 90 percent of the training provided managers is in the area of technical skill. Yet they spend nearly 85 percent of their time dealing with "people problems." There will need to be continuous emphasis on training in the areas of self esteem, interpersonal dynamics, and team dynamics.

- *Strategy Six*– Promote effective leadership. Effective leaders focus on "doing the right thing" by (1) having a vision– an image, idea, and belief about how things could be better, (2) being clear about their values regarding employees, customers, and quality, and instilling these values within their organizations, (3) having the courage to act on their beliefs and values, and (4) holding themselves and others accountable for commitments and results.
- *Strategy Seven*– Ethics: managing delicate balances and difficult choices. The rate of change plus the number and kind of decisions managers must make pushes the limits of what is "right" versus what people sometimes have to do to "get things done." For many organizations, success will be determined by the delicate balances and difficult choices their people make; their ability to "do the right thing." Ethics is about "decency," doing what is good for the organization and what is right for the customers and the employees.

Striving for excellence is a very worthy goal, but you better not wait too long. There are bold and courageous people out there who have already started.

Whatever you can do, or dream you can . . . begin it.
Boldness has genius, power, and magic in it.
– Goethe

Bibliography

Anderson, Leith. *Dying for Change.* Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 1990.

APPA: The Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers. *Basic Tools for Facility Supervisors.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1995.

—— . *Rightsizing Effectively: An APPA Task Force Report.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1995.

The Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA). *Facilities Management: A Manual for Plant Administration,* 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1989.

—— . *Tapping Potential: Issues in Human Resource Management.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1991.

Batten, Joe D. *Tough-Minded Leadership.* New York: American Management Association, 1989.

Bennis, Warren. *On Becoming A Leader.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1989a.

—— . *Why Leaders Can't Lead.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989b.

—— . *An Invented Life.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1993.

Bennis, Warren, and Burt Nanus. *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge,* New York: Harper and Row, 1985.

Black, Jerry C. "Management by Strategic Planning (MBSP)." In *Proceedings of the 1995 Educational Conference & 82nd Annual Meeting.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1995.

Blanchard, Kenneth, and Spencer Johnson. *The One Minute Manager.* New York: Berkley, 1986.

Burns, James M. *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Campbell, Andrew, and Laura L. Nash. *A Sense of Mission: Defining Direction for the Large Corporation.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1992.

Covey, Stephen R. *Principle Centered Leadership.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.

—— . *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People.* New York: Fireside, Simon & Schuster, 1989.

Covey, Stephen R., A. Roger Merrill, and Rebecca R. Merrill. *First Things First.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

Crosby, Philip B. *Quality Without Tears.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Daigneau, William A. "Reshaping Higher Education's Facilities Management." In *Proceedings of the 1993 Educational Conference and 80th Annual Meeting.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1993.

Daigneau, William A., and J. Rayford Whitley. "The Successful Executive Search." In *Proceedings of the 78th Annual Meeting.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1991.

Dalebozik, Roy M., and Judith L. Hanson. "The New Partnership: Men and Women in Facilities Management." In *Proceedings of the 1994 Educational Conference and 81st Annual Meeting.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1994.

Deming, W. Edwards. *Out of the Crisis.* Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1982.

DePree, Max. *Leadership is an Art.* New York: Dell Publishing, 1989.

Dolence, Michael G., and Donald M. Norris. *Transforming Higher Education: A Vision for Learning in the 21st Century.* Ann Arbor, MI: Society for College and University Planning, 1995.

Dougherty, Jennifer, Jillinda Kidwell, Donna Knight, Loren Hubbell, and Sean Rush. *Business Process Reengineering for Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1994.

Drucker, Peter F. *The Effective Executive.* New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

—— . *The New Realities.* New York: HarperCollins, 1989.

Gardner, Mike. "University/Corporate Partnerships Can Help Address Capital Needs." *Inside APPA,* June 1995.

Ginsburg, Sigmund G. "Outlook for Higher Education and Facilities Management Over the Next Three to Five Years." *APPA Newsletter,* November 1994.

Glazner, Steve. "The Personal Leadership of Charlie Jenkins." *Facilities Manager,* Fall 1994.

Glazner, Steve, ed. Leadership theme issue, *Facilities Manager,* Winter 1995.

Goldstein, Philip J., Daphne E. Kempner, and Sean C. Rush. *Contract Management or Self-Operation: A Decision-Making Guide for Higher Education.* Alexandria, VA: published by APPA for CHEMA: The Council of Higher Education Management Associations, 1993.

Greenleaf, Robert K. *Servant Leadership: A Journey in to the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness.* New York: Paulist Press, 1977.

Hascall, Robert S., Alvin W. Hopkins, and Maurice Hollman. "In This Era of Shrinking Budgets, Is Organizational Redesign and Adopting a 'Quality Culture' Worth the Pain?" In *Proceedings of the 1995 Educational Conference and 82nd Annual Meeting.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1995.

Helgelsen, Sally. *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership.* New York: Doubleday, 1990.

Helmer, Ray G. *Time Management for Engineers and Constructors.* American Society of Civil Engineers, 1991.

Hickman, Craig R. *Mind of a Manager, Soul of a Leader.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1990.

Humes, James C. *The Sir Winston Method: The Five Secrets of Speaking the Language of Leadership.* New York: William Morrow and Company, 1991.

Jenkins, Ann M. "Understanding Cross-Cultural Issues in the Workplace." In *Proceedings of the 79th Annual Meeting.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1992.

Kaiser, Harvey H. "Rightsizing Through Restructuring: A Higher Education Challenge." *Facilities Manager,* Fall 1994.

Kilpatrick, Diane F. "The Evolution of Organized Labor in Higher Education: Time for a Change." *APPA Newsletter,* March 1994.

Kirkpatrick, Thomas O. *Supervision.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1987.

Kotter, John P. *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management.* New York: The Free Press, 1990.

Kouzes, James M., and Barry Z. Posner. *Credibility: How Leaders Gain It and Lose It, Why People Demand It.*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

LeBoeuf, Michael. *How to Win Customers and Keep Them for Life*, New York: The Berkeley Publishing Group, 1987.

Leroy, Wayne E., E. Lander Medlin, and Steve Glazner. "Vision, People, and Process: An Interview With APPA President Doug Christensen." *Facilities Manager*, Fall 1995.

Loden, Marilyn. *Feminine Leadership*. New York: Times Books, 1985.

Mackay, Harvey. *Swim with the Sharks*. Oberlin, OH: College Stores Research & Educational Foundation, 1993.

Maslow, Abraham. *Toward a Psychology of Being*, 2nd ed. New York: Van Nostrand, 1968.

Miller, Richard, ed. *Applying theDeming Method to Higher Education*. Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association, 1991.

Mitroff, Ian I., and Harold A. Linstone. *The Unbounded Mind: Breaking the Chains of Traditional Business Thinking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Morrell, Louis R. "Privatization and the Senior Facilities Manager." *APPA Newsletter*, September 1994.

Nanus, Burt. *The Vision Retreat: A Facilitator's Guide* and *The Vision Retreat: A Participant's Handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

—— . *Visionary Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Oncken, Willliam. *Managing Management Time*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984.

Orsborn, Carol. *Inner Excellence: Spiritual Principles of Life-Driven Business*. San Rafael, CA: New World Library, 1992.

Pastin, Mark. *The Hard Problems of Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

Peters, Tom. *Liberation Management: Necessary Disorganization for the Nanosecond Nineties*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

Peters, Tom, and Nancy Austin. *A Passion for Excellence: The Leadership Difference*. New York: Warner Books, 1985.

Peters, Thomas J., and Robert H. Waterman Jr. *In Search of Excellence*, New York: Warner Books, 1982.

Petillo, J.T. "Learning from Success and Failure in Quality Management." *Facilities Manager*, Fall 1993.

Pierce, Jon L., and John W. Newstrom. *The Managers Bookshelf,* 3rd ed. New York: HarperCollins, 1993.

Qayoumi, Mohammad H. "The 2020 Vision." *Facilities Manager,* Spring 1992.

Ragusa, Sam. "The Competitive Edge: How an Organization's Administration Can Help or Hinder." *APPA Newsletter,* March 1993.

Reynolds, Gary L. *Building Quality: TQM for Campus Facilities Managers.* Alexandria, VA: APPA, 1994.

—— . "Total Quality Management for Campus Facilities." *Facilities Manager,* Summer 1992.

Ryan, Kathleen D., and Daniel K. Ostereich. *Driving Fear out of the Workplace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Saint Mary's University. *Customer Service with Tender Loving Care,* 1994 videotape. Distributed by APPA.

Safire, William, and Leonard Safire, eds. *Leadership.* New York: Fireside, Simon & Schuster,1990.

Schapiro, Nicole. *Negotiating for Your Life: New Success Strategies for Women.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1993.

Senge, Peter. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization.* New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell, 1990.

Singer, Benjamin. "The Future-Focused Role-Image," in Alvin Toffler, *Learning for Tomorrow: The Role of the Future in Education,* pp. 19-32. New York: Random House, 1974.

Smith, Bertram D. Jr. "Benchmarking: Old Technique, New Frontier." *Facilities Manager,* Spring 1995.

Smith, Ed. "Pueblo's Facilities Support Partnership: A University and a School District Manage Change." *Facilities Manager,* Spring 1994.

Ulstrup, Leif, and Mark Raiffa. "When TQM Is Not Enough and BPR Is Too Much!" In *Proceedings of the 1993 Educational Conference and 80th Annual Meeting.* Alexandria, VA: 1993.

Waitley, Denis. *The Double Win.* New York: Berkley, 1988.

Wheatley, Margaret J. *Leadership and the New Science.* San Francisco: Berrett-Kohler, 1992.

ISBN: 0-913359-90-4

The Association of
Higher Education
Facilities Officers

1446 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314